Concordia Theological Monthly

LEHRE UND WEHRE
MAGAZIN FUER EXEGETISCHE HOMILETIK
THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. III. January 1932 No. 1

Page

ARNDT, W.: Vorwort 1

LAETSCH, TH.: Die Schriftlehre von der Verstockung 7

MUELLER, J. T.: Introduction to Moral Theology 19

KRETZMANN, P. E.: Apostolat, Predigtamt, Pfarramt, Synodalamt 33

LAETSCH, TH.: Studies in Hosea 53

Dispositionen ueber die zweite von der Synodalkonferenz angenommene Evangelienreihe 65

Miscellanea 55

Theological Observer. — Kirchengeschichtliches 57

Book Review. — Literatur 73

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein [illegible] kein Ding, das die Leute mehr also dass er [illegible] unterrichten [illegible] Kirche behaelt denn die gute als rechte [illegible] auch dieselben [illegible] Apologie, Art. 24

als die Gesetz [illegible] For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, falscher Lehre [illegible] fuehren. — [illegible] prepare himself to the battle? I Cor. 14, 8.

Ev. [illegible] and Other States
CONCORDIA [illegible] Louis, Mo.

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. III JANUARY, 1932 No. 1

Foreword.

When in 1855 *Lehre und Wehre,* the chief ancestor of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, made its appearance, it could be compared to a vigorous youth who with his right hand held aloft the Bible and with his left the Confessions of the Lutheran Church. From the very beginning it was apparent to all readers that the editors conceived of their task as consisting in promulgating and defending, with all the theological apparatus and equipment available, "God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure." Month after month scholarly articles, pointed paragraphs on current religious happenings, and informing book reviews came before the public on its pages, and all testified that here there was a journal which meant in every respect to abide by the teachings of the Holy Scriptures and of the Lutheran Confessions collected in the Book of Concord of 1580. While undoubtedly on some points touching the nature and the policy of the new journal contemporary opinion was divided, it is difficult to see, as one pages through the early volumes, how there can have been any dissension on the position this journal meant to take and to maintain with respect to the Bible and the Lutheran Confessions.

It was to be expected, of course, that this position would be attacked and that an ugly and, especially to a Lutheran, extremely odious interpretation would be put on it, to wit, that the men responsible for the publication of the journal were introducing two standards into the Church by which it was to govern its faith and its life, one divine, the other human, and that they were placing the contents of the Book of Concord on a level with the holy writings of the apostles and prophets. To the superficial observer it seemed the critics had a good case. The Scriptures and the Confessions — this slogan appeared to furnish all the evidence needed. A strange anomaly it was said to be. The promoters of *Lehre und Wehre* were the very people who with much emphasis repeated the words of the aged Luther, *"Deus impleat vos odio Papae!"* and now it seemed they themselves

were setting up a Pope, not one of flesh and blood, to be sure, but a Pope nevertheless — the *corpus* of the Lutheran Confessions. How odd it seemed that the men who boasted of the freedom which Luther had won for the Christian world through the Reformation apparently were eager to forge fetters of slavery for themselves and others!

But the publishers of the journal were able to show without much difficulty that such an accusation, though in the view of some buttressed by annihilating evidence, was entirely groundless. They recognized, so they pointed out, but one authority in the Church, the Holy Scriptures. The Confessions, on the other hand, were to them just what the name says they are, actual, real confessions, declarations of the faith that lived in the early Lutheran fathers and in them, too, clear utterances as to what they believed the Scriptures to teach and to inculcate. With much emphasis they stated their belief that no divine authority attached to the Confessions, as though they had been given by inspiration of God; that, on the contrary, these documents were produced by fallible men, not at all to be compared with the prophets and apostles, and that whoever invested them with the authority of divine writings was indeed making a Pope of them and thereby abandoning the principles of the blessed Reformation.

But while voicing the loyalty to the Scriptures as the only divinely given norm for faith and life and doing it with a fervor which has seldom, if ever, been surpassed, they told the world quite fearlessly that it was their firm belief the Lutheran Confessions taught the truths of Holy Scripture in their heavenly purity and that they therefore were determined to abide by these Confessions to the last breath. With great rejoicing they proclaimed to the critics who likened the Symbolical Books to fetters that these Confessions contained for them, not opinions which had been dictated to them, but their own sacred convictions; not cruel laws imposed by some foreign potentate, but saving beliefs which they cherished; not a prison-house designed to hold captive all their thoughts and mental energies, but their own "home, sweet home," bequeathed to them by the fathers, which they were not willing to exchange for all the pleasures and palaces the wide world might offer. The Confessions were to them a banner which symbolized freedom and great privileges. When they placed themselves under this banner, it was not owing to external constraint, but to the conviction that the benefits which this flag stood for were real and inexpressibly precious. That a flag may symbolize tyranny to those who are marching under it is, of course, true enough. We think of the poor Hessians, who in the Revolutionary War fought under the British flag here in America, men who had been taken away from their native country, in many a case against their will, and who bore arms in a cause which was alien to their hearts. They were marching to battle like slaves. But how different the position

of the men who, opposing them, fought under the flag of the united colonies, volunteers who left their homes and endured hardships and braved dangers and death, not because they had to, but because they wanted to, their flag symbolizing to them freedom from intolerable oppression! It was thus that the publishers of *Lehre und Wehre* viewed the Lutheran Confessions. How utterly the charge that they were establishing a human beside the divine authority in the Church collapses! Just as little as the soldiers of an army who are fighting under their general and under their flag are acknowledging two leaders, so little did these men by their insistence on the Word and the Confessions bow to two masters in the Church.

In speaking of the meaning of the Lutheran Confessions to the founders of *Lehre und Wehre,* we must not overlook that they indeed regarded these documents as being the authoritative voice of Lutheranism, to be heeded by all that desired to be classed as Lutherans and to be consulted if anybody wished to obtain information on the doctrinal position of this Church. The Confessions, then, to them were not only a means for publishing their convictions regarding the great truths taught in the Scriptures, but they were in their view likewise a badge designating the wearer as a member of the Lutheran Church. Conversely they held that whoever laid claim to the name Lutheran should not fail to display this badge. With great vigor they assailed the position of those who, while adorning themselves with the name Lutheran, were unwilling to accept fully the teachings of the Lutheran Confessions. "If you wish to be a Lutheran, then *be* a Lutheran and do not deceive yourself and other people by a partial acceptance of the Lutheran standards." To make this idea a live and potent one in the consciousness of Lutherans, they expended the magnificent stores of their learning and eloquence; for it they labored and strove with burning, untiring zeal. Being Lutherans to the core, they abhorred the thought that views might be expressed in their journal which ran counter to the teachings of the Confessions. If they should permit such a situation to develop, they felt they would lay themselves open to the charge of insincerity and dishonesty, not adhering to their own professions. Yes, they intended to examine everything they themselves and others wrote for their journal as to its full agreement with the Lutheran symbolical books, because they were convinced they could not be consistent Lutherans without taking this course. In the prospectus of *Lehre und Wehre,* issued in 1854, they had stated as their guiding principle: "The Holy Scriptures, and after it the Book of Concord of our Evangelical Lutheran Church, will be the norm of all essays that will be accepted for publication, Scripture being the *norma normans,* the Confessions the *norma normata.*" Thus, while carefully distinguishing between the Scriptures and the Confessions, they unhesitatingly called the latter

a *norma* for themselves; of course, a *norma normata,* a derived norm, which possessed authority for them because they had found it to agree in its teachings with the inspired writings given us in the Scriptures.

It is generally admitted that, when our fathers began the publication of the new journal, the Lutheran Confessions had in many a quarter here in America fallen on evil days. In 1853 a book appeared, written by an influential Lutheran, Dr. Benjamin Kurtz, editor of the *Lutheran Observer,* which bore the title *Why Are You a Lutheran?* The author appears rather ashamed of the Lutheran confessional writings and minimizes their importance, saying of them (p. 15): "They contain the prominent doctrines of the Bible as understood by Lutherans, methodically arranged for the sake of perspicuity, but are binding no further than as they faithfully set forth the revealed mind of the Holy Spirit. The principal of these writings is the Augsburg Confession, and even in relation to that no more is required, even of ministers at their ordination, than to believe that 'the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God are taught in a manner substantially correct in its doctrinal articles.' The other symbolical summaries are not referred to at all even at the admission of private members or of ministers." What a sad evaluation of the standards of the Lutheran Church by one of her sons, appointed to be a leader in her battles!

Still more depressing was the spectacle presented, in the very year when *Lehre und Wehre* began its career, in an anonymous pamphlet the author of which dared to do to the Augsburg Confession what Melanchthon had done to it in 1540, namely, to alter it in order to make it more acceptable to human reason, with this difference, however, that he proceeded in far more radical fashion than Melanchthon had ever dreamed of doing. A decade later Dr. S. S. Schmucker, Professor of Dogmatics at the Gettysburg Lutheran Seminary, publicly admitted that he was the author of this lamentable attempt at a revision. The title of the pamphlet was *Definite Platform, Doctrinal and Disciplinarian, for Evangelical Lutheran District Synods, Constructed in Accordance with the Principles of the General Synod.* In the language of Dr. Adolph Spaeth: "This 'American recension' of the Augsburg Confession coolly charged that venerable document, the *magna carta* of Protestantism, with a number of gross errors and changed or mutilated twelve out of its twenty-one doctrinal articles, omitting altogether the second part of the Confession, the seven articles on abuses." (*Memorial of William Julius Mann,* p. 56.) The author of the *Definite Platform* called the tendency which he and others represented American Lutheranism, as he unhesitatingly disavowed the old positions which Luther and his coworkers had occupied and which the grand leaders of the Church in succeeding generations, Chemnitz, Gerhard, Loescher, to mention only a few, had valiantly defended.

This episode, better than anything else, describes the atmosphere which prevailed in wide circles here in America when *Lehre und Wehre* came upon the scene. These circles, while not quite ready to drop the name Lutheran, felt little enthusiasm for what was distinctively Lutheran in doctrine and forms of worship. The peculiar teachings of the Lutheran Church were looked upon as outmoded and were studiously ignored. From the mighty granite boulder representing Lutheran theology, by careful polishing, all edges and corners had been removed, and now it lay there a rounded, nondescript stone among other stones similarly polished, not likely to hurt anybody, but neither of a kind to set the heart of the passer-by on fire with visions of strength and virility. Imagine the feelings of the founders of *Lehre und Wehre* when they beheld a Lutheranism of this diluted, anemic, apologetic, vacillating type. Hailing in many instances from rationalistic environments, they had through prayerful study of the Holy Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions, to which were added the writings of Luther and other great teachers of the Church, in some cases after severe spiritual struggles, reached the blessed assurance that the Lutheran teachings represent the doctrines of the Scriptures and that, in accepting them, they were giving their assent to the eternal truths which God in His mercy has revealed to the world. Passionately they loved these teachings. In them they saw the gold and the fine gold exalted in the sacred rhapsodies of the Book of Psalms. Rather than to forget them, they were willing to let their right hand forget its cunning and to have their tongue cleave to the roof of their mouth. It filled their soul with indignation to see some of these teachings treated with indifference, cavalierly, as though little significance attached to them. Whether they would be able to remedy the situation in the American Lutheran Church they did not know, but they wished to inform the world that there were at least some sons of the Lutheran Church who strongly resented the treatment their poor mother was subjected to and who were not ashamed of the jewels she wore and of the house she lived in, called "old-fashioned" by many people, but who were willing to stand at her side and bear all reproaches which a rationalistic and unionistic age might heap upon her.

With all this passionate fervor for an uncompromising Lutheranism, the founders of *Lehre und Wehre* did not fall into that fanatical scholasticism which from admiration of its own system forgets entirely that the chief business of the Church must be the preaching of the Gospel of salvation and which is constantly disputing and wrangling about its own definitions of what constitutes proper food instead of handing out this food to the starving multitudes. While insisting on orthodoxy, being unwilling to see one jot or tittle of the Scriptures rejected, they were thoroughly evangelical, making Christ

and His work of redemption and the justification of the sinner by grace through faith the center of their theological thinking and writing. A powerful influence to keep their ship in this course were the works of Luther, which they studied with exemplary devotion and energy. Sitting at the feet of the great Reformer, imbiding both his love of the truth and his joy over the free grace of God, they avoided the extreme of unionism and indifferentism, where divine truth is held cheaply, and its opposite, the extreme of fanaticism, where vilification, fire, and sword take the place of argument and love, mercy, and fairness are praised, but not practised.

This manly, determined espousal of the cause of the time-honored Lutheran teachings was not without glorious results. The last century witnessed a remarkable reawakening of Lutheran consciousness, and among the factors which produced and aided it *Lehre und Wehre* is entitled to an important place. It has often been pointed out that Lutheranism in America is far more confessional to-day than it was in 1855. In rejoicing over this situation, let us gratefully remember the chief editors of this journal, Drs. Walther, Pieper, and Bente, a noble trio, who, assisted by like-minded co-workers, were a great force in the movement to place and keep the light of Lutheran doctrine on a high candlestick, visible to all who wish to see.

"The Scriptures and the Confessions" — such is the slogan of the editors of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY as they are endeavoring to continue the work so nobly begun by the promoters of the mother journal. That a militant, vigorous insistence on loyalty to the Confessions of the Lutheran Church is imperatively needed to-day no conservative Lutheran who is at all acquainted with current tendencies in religious matters will be disposed to deny. In the denominations surrounding us confessionalism is disappearing at a frightful rate. The historic American Protestant church-bodies are largely disintegrating under the influence of Modernism. The old appellations are losing their meaning. That a man, for instance, claims membership in the Methodist Church and calls himself a Methodist is far from being a guarantee that his doctrinal views are those of Wesley and the Methodist catechisms. If there ever existed the need of clear, definite notes from the trumpet of the loyal adherents of revealed truth as they are proclaiming their message to the world, that need exists to-day. In the Lutheran Church of America, in spite of very considerable progress made during the last seventy-five years, an energetic, firm, uncompromising stand in behalf of the Confesions of the Church is still sorely needed; for here, too, the cry of "union at any price" is being heard, and indifferentism and Modernism are creeping in and doing their destructive work. Every faithful son of the Lutheran Church should be on the alert to prevent

the importation of the leaven of a false liberalism into the household and to remove it where it has surreptitiously been brought in. The men who have been entrusted with the guidance of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY pray that they may always be found loyal to the position that in the Lutheran Confessions the great, divine, indestructible, everlasting truths which God in the Scriptures has revealed for the salvation of sinners are set forth in their purity and that the great Head of the Church may mercifully deign to bless their humble efforts as they, together with their brethren, are striving for the spread and the defense of confessional Lutheranism.

W. ARNDT.

Die Schriftlehre von der Verſtockung.

Gottes Wort ſagt uns, daß wir zum Glauben kommen nach der Wirkung der allmächtigen Stärke Gottes, welche er gewirkt hat in Chriſto, da er ihn von den Toten auferweckt hat, Eph. 1, 19. 20, daß alſo die Bekehrungsgnade eine allmächtige Gnade iſt. Dasſelbe Wort Gottes ſagt uns, daß die Menſchen die traurige Macht beſitzen, ſich gegen dieſe allmächtige, heilſpendende Gnade zu verhärten und zu verſtocken und alſo an ihrem Teil den allmächtig wirkenden Gnadenwillen Gottes außer Kraft zu ſetzen. Gottes Wort ſagt uns, daß es Gottes ernſtlicher Wille ſei, alle Menſchen zu bekehren und ſelig zu machen. Dasſelbe Gotteswort ſagt uns auch, daß derſelbe barmherzige, gnädige Gott in gerechtem Gericht gewiſſe Sünder verſtockt, verhärtet, ſie in ihren verkehrten Sinn dahingibt, aufhört, noch weiter an ihnen zu arbeiten, ihnen ſchon bei ihren Lebzeiten Gelegenheit und Raum zur Buße abſchneidet. Die Selbſtverſtockung des Menſchen iſt die grauſigſte Sünde, deren der Menſch ſich ſchuldig machen kann, die Verſtockung des Menſchen durch Gott das grauſigſte Gericht, das in dieſer Welt über einen Menſchen kommen kann. Gerade die Lehre von der Verſtockung des Menſchen gehört zu den Wegen und Gerichten Gottes, die der ſuperklugen menſchlichen Vernunft ein Ärgernis und eine Torheit ſind und ihr immer wieder Anlaß geben zu allerlei Fragen und Zweifeln und Einwänden, ja auch zu mancherlei gottesläſterlichen Reden. Weil auch Chriſten und chriſtliche Theologen nicht gegen ſolche Gedanken gefeit ſind, ſo lohnt es ſich, einmal wieder etwas ausführlicher auf dieſe Lehre einzugehen. Wir wollen das tun, indem wir das Beiſpiel der Verſtockung betrachten, das Gott ſelbſt in ausführlicher Weiſe in die Heilige Schrift hat einzeichnen laſſen, auf das auch Paulus im Neuen Teſtament aufmerkſam macht, das Beiſpiel der Verſtockung Pharaos, 2 Moſ. 5—14, und Röm. 9, 17—20. Wir wollen dabei zunächſt auf die Selbſtverſtockung Pharaos und das Gericht der Verſtockung über Pharao achten und ſodann auf die Urſache und den Zweck der Verſtockung.

Zunächſt ſeien etliche ſprachliche Bemerkungen geſtattet. Für den Begriff Verſtockung werden im Hebräiſchen verſchiedene Wörter gebraucht. Neben den Ausdrücken amaz leb, das Herz feſtigen (5 Moſ. 2, 30 uſw.), und kaschach leb, das Herz verhärten (nur Jeſ. 63, 17), die in unſerer Geſchichte nicht vorkommen, werden hauptſächlich drei Wörter gebraucht, die auch Moſes auf die Verſtockung Pharaos anwendet, die Wörter chazak, kabed, kaschah. Chazak heißt im Kalſtamm hart ſein oder hart werden. Das Pihel hat kauſative Bedeutung. Das Kal kommt nur von der Selbſtverſtockung vor, Ex. 7, 13. 22; 8, 15; 9, 35, alſo viermal. Das Pihel kommt nur von der Verſtockung von ſeiten Gottes vor, 4, 21; 9, 12; 10, 20. 27; 11, 10; 14, 4. 8. 17, alſo achtmal. — Kabed heißt im Kal ſchwer ſein; dann wird es von erſchwertem Gebrauch der Glieder gebraucht, z. B. Gen. 48, 10; Jeſ. 59, 1, vom Herzen, verſtockt ſein. Das Kal kommt nur von der Selbſtverſtockung vor, Ex. 7, 14; 9, 7. Das Hiphil heißt ſchwer machen, verhärten, verſtocken und kommt dreimal von der Selbſtverſtockung vor, 8, 11. 29. 34, und einmal vom Gericht der Verſtockung, 10, 1. — Kaschah heißt hart ſein, ſchwer ſein, 1 Sam. 5, 7; ſchwierig ſein, Deut. 1, 17; 15, 18; das Hiphil, ſchwer machen oder auch Schwierigkeiten bereiten. Ex. 7, 3 ſagt Gott, ani akscheh, ich werde ſchwer machen, das Herz Pharaos. Ex. 13, 15 leſen wir: hikschah Phar'oh. Da hier das Wort leb, Herz, fehlt, ſo überſetzt Geſenius: „Pharao machte Schwierigkeiten.“ Keil und andere ſupplieren Herz und überſetzen auch hier: verſtocken. Da das Wort ohne leb an keiner andern Stelle von der Verſtockung gebraucht wird, ſo iſt es wohl ſicherer, hier die überſetzung Geſenius' anzunehmen. So Luther und die engliſche Bibel.

Durch die verſchiedenen Wörter für Verſtockung ſoll nicht etwa ein verſchiedener Grad der Verſtockung angezeigt werden. Das wird einem ſofort klar werden, wenn man auf die Reihenfolge achtet, in der dieſe Ausdrücke von Moſes gebraucht werden; Ex. 7, 13 chazzek; 7, 14 kabed; 7, 22 chazzek; 8, 11 hakbed; 8, 15 chazzek; 8, 28 jakbed; 9, 7 jikbad; 9, 34 jakbed; 9, 35 chazzek.

1. Die Selbſtverſtockung Pharaos.

Gerade an Pharao ſehen wir klar und deutlich die ſelbſtverſchuldete Verſtockung als Ausfluß und natürliche Auswirkung des erbſündlichen Verderbens.

1. Auf die Bitte Moſis, das Volk ziehen zu laſſen, um ein Feſt zu feiern, Ex. 5, 1, antwortet Pharao ſtolz und hochmütig V. 2: „Wer iſt der HErr, des Stimme ich hören müſſe und Israel ziehen laſſen? Ich weiß nichts von dem HErrn, will auch Israel nicht laſſen ziehen.“

2. Auf die Begründung der Bitte, 5, 3, antwortet er mit der offenbaren lügenhaften Beſchuldigung, daß Moſes das Volk nur aufwiegeln wolle, und mit um ſo härterer Bedrückung, 5, 4—23. So ſetzt Pharao

von allem Anfang an dem Willen Gottes hartnäckig ſeinen eigenen Willen entgegen, offenbart dadurch die natürliche Härtigkeit ſeines Herzens und beweiſt die Wahrheit der Schriftworte von dem ſteinernen Herzen, Heſek. 11,19, von dem Greuelweſen des natürlichen Menſchen, Pſ. 14, 1, daß alle abgewichen und untüchtig ſind, alſo daß keiner Gutes tue, auch nicht einer, Pſ. 14, 3, ja daß alle ohne Ausnahme tot ſind in übertretungen und Sünden. Der Teufel, dieſer abgeſagte Feind und Widerſacher Gottes, hat eben ſein Werk in den Kindern des Unglaubens, Eph. 2, 2., und zwar nach V. 3 in allen, daher alle Ungläubigen weiter nichts als Gott widerſtreben können.

3. Nachdem Moſes und Aaron ihren Stab in eine Schlange verwandelt hatten und dieſer Stab die durch Beſchwörungskünſte der ägyptiſchen Zauberer in Schlangen verwandelten Stäbe verſchlungen hatte, heißt es zum erſtenmal: wajechezak leb Phar'oh, Ex. 7, 13. Luther: „Alſo ward das Herz Pharaos verſtockt"; die engliſche Bibel: "And He hardened Pharaoh's heart." Eigentlich heißt es, das Herz Pharaos wurde oder war feſt, hart. Es iſt hier alſo noch nicht von einer Verſtockung Pharaos von ſeiten Gottes die Rede, wie die Überſetzungen es zum Ausdruck bringen, ſondern es wird einfach die Tatſache konſtatiert, daß Pharaos Herz feſt, hart war. Es wird hier alſo die natürliche Herzenshärtigkeit des Pharao beſchrieben, wie ſie ſich aktiv und wider beſſeres Wiſſen gegen Gottes Willen auflehnt. Er hätte wenigſtens ſo viel erkennen können, daß dieſer Gott mächtiger ſei als ſeine Götzen. Das will er nicht, 7, 10—13. Darauf lautet das Urteil Gottes, 7, 14: „Das Herz Pharaos iſt hart, ſchwer", kabed leb Phar'oh; er weigert ſich, das Volk zu laſſen.

4. Nun folgt als zweites Zeichen die erſte Plage, die Verwandlung des Waſſers in Blut. Wohl tun die Zauberer ähnliches; aber welch ein Unterſchied zwiſchen dem Wunder Gottes und der Nachäffung der Zauberer! Moſes ſchlägt einfach ins Waſſer, 7, 20. Sie müſſen erſt zu Beſchwörungen ihre Zuflucht nehmen, V. 22. Auch können ſie die Plage nicht abwenden, ſo daß es offenbar wird, daß der HErr den Strom geſchlagen hat, 7, 25. V. 22 leſen wir nun wieder genau dieſelben Worte wie V. 13: „Das Herz Pharaos wurde hart", und V. 23 wird geſagt: „Er nahm es nicht zu Herzen", eigentlich: „Er richtete ſein Herz auch nicht hierauf." Das Herz iſt hier, wie öfters, der Sitz des Willens und des Entſchluſſes. Vgl. Jer. 5, 23, abtrünniges Herz; Ex. 35, 22, williges Herz; Richt. 5, 16; Jeſ. 10, 7; 63, 4. Er wollte nicht hören; ſtatt durch die Allmacht und Güte Gottes ſich zur Buße leiten zu laſſen, gab er ſeinem Herzen eine andere Richtung, zu hartnäckigem Ungehorſam. Dadurch wird ein weiterer Schritt in der Verhärtung durch eigene Schuld angezeigt.

5. Nach der zweiten Plage (Fröſche) leſen wir Kap. 8, 15: „Da aber Pharao ſah, daß er Luft gekriegt hatte, ward ſein Herz verhärtet",

machte er sein Herz schwer. Wiederum ist mit diesem Wort die Selbstverstockung beschrieben und wieder unter erschwerten Umständen. Wohl hatten die Zauberer Frösche hervorgebracht (allerdings unter Umständen, da es keine große Kunst war, Frösche aufzuweisen), aber wegschaffen hatten sie sie nicht können. Trotzdem Moses aber ausdrücklich von Pharao die Zeit hatte bestimmen lassen und trotzdem genau zu der Zeit und in der Weise, wie von Moses vorausgesagt, das Land befreit worden war (V. 9, verglichen mit V. 13) und trotzdem die Erleichterung, harechawah (man beachte den Artikel, also die von Moses vorausgesagte und von Gott gewirkte Erleichterung), gekommen war, V. 15, so machte er trotz alledem sein Herz schwer, geriet tiefer und immer tiefer in Schuld, 7, 26 bis 8, 11.

6. Während der dritten Plage (Läuse, die die Zauberer nicht hervorbringen können, 8, 18) strecken die Zauberer die Waffen und bekennen öffentlich: „Das ist Gottes Finger", V. 19. Dennoch lesen wir zum drittenmal denselben Ausdruck wie 7, 13 und 7, 22: „Das Herz Pharaos wurde hart." Mochten auch die Zauberer zugeben, daß hier Gott, der Allmächtige, handle, er tat es nicht. Wider besseres Wissen, wider den hellen, klaren Augenschein wurde sein Herz fest und hart, das heißt, weil es früher schon hart gewesen war, nun um so härter.

7. Während der vierten Plage (Ungeziefer, wahrscheinlich Hundsfliegen), bei der Gott zum erstenmal einen Unterschied setzte zwischen Israel und den Ägyptern zu dem ausgesprochenen Zweck, daß Pharao innewürde, daß Gott auch inmitten des Landes Ägypten der HErr sei, V. 22, und nun das Land nahe daran war, von dem Ungeziefer verderbt zu werden, fordert wohl Pharao Moses und gestattet ihm, im Lande zu opfern, V. 25. Ja, als Moses darauf besteht, drei Tagereisen in die Wüste zu wandern, V. 27, gibt Pharao nach mit Hinzufügung der Bitte: „Bittet für mich." Aber nur die Angst der Verzweiflung treibt ihn zu der Erlaubnis, nicht Herzensänderung, wahre, aufrichtige Buße. Denn trotzdem Moses den König ausdrücklich warnt, daß er ihn ja nicht wieder täusche, wie er ihn bisher getäuscht habe, so verhärtet Pharao sein Herz auch dasselbe Mal, V. 32, während man doch so gewiß erwarten konnte, daß er diesmal nachgeben werde. „Auch dasselbe Mal" wird hinzugefügt, um wiederum eine Stufe der Selbstverstockung Pharaos anzudeuten, 8, 16—32.

8. Bei der fünften Plage (Rinderpest), in welcher ebenfalls Gosen verschont blieb, 9, 6, vergewisserte sich Pharao durch eine Gesandtschaft, daß Gosen nicht betroffen worden war, V. 7, daß es also wirklich eine Strafe Gottes, ein Gericht für seinen Ungehorsam sei, und doch lesen wir V. 7: „Das Herz Pharaos ward verstockt", eigentlich wurde schwer.

Achten wir darauf, daß die Plagen nicht nur immer schwerer und drückender wurden, sondern daß, wie wir gesehen haben, bei jeder Plage

ein gewiſſer Umſtand beſonders hervorgehoben wird, der Pharao hätte bewegen ſollen, der immer wieder an ihn ergehenden Aufforderung Gottes Folge zu leiſten. Aber weder durch die Aufforderung noch durch die beſonderen Umſtände ließ Pharao ſich zum Gehorſam bewegen, ſondern gegen beide verhärtete, verſtockte er ſein Herz in ſich immer ſteigernder Bosheit, in immer hartnäckigerem Ungehorſam.

Beachten wir ferner, daß ſechsmal geſagt wird, Pharao verſtockte, verhärtete ſein Herz, und daß zweimal vorher geſagt worden iſt, daß er dem Willen Gottes ſeinen eigenen Willen entgegenſetzte. Achtmal hatte der HErr ihm Gelegenheit gegeben, ſich ihm zu unterwerfen, achtmal ihn aufgefordert, ſein Volk ziehen zu laſſen, ſechsmal durch Zeichen und Wunder gezeigt, daß er der HErr ſei, der ein Recht habe, unbedingten Gehorſam zu fordern. Und achtmal verhärtet Pharao ſein Herz, achtmal verſchließt er die Herzenstür, ſchlägt gleichſam auf ſein Herz ein, um es noch härter zu machen, als es von Natur war. Nicht nur weigert er ſich, ſein Herz von Gott erweichen zu laſſen, ſondern in tatſächlicher Widerſetzlichkeit gegen Gottes Willen verhärtet, verſtockt er ſein Herz.

Das iſt die Selbſtverſtockung Pharaos als Beiſpiel der Selbſtverſtockung des Menſchen. Die Verſtockung des Menſchen iſt, wie geſagt, weiter nichts als der natürliche Ausfluß und die natürliche Auswirkung der angebornen Feindſchaft des menſchlichen Herzens wider Gott und ſeinen Willen. Aus ſich ſelbſt heraus kann der Menſch nichts als widerſtreben. Iſt doch das Dichten und Trachten des menſchlichen Herzens böſe von Jugend auf, Gen. 8, 21. Fleiſchlich geſinnt ſein iſt eine Feindſchaft wider Gott, Röm. 8, 7, und weil der Menſch Fleiſch vom Fleiſch geboren iſt, Joh. 3, 6, alſo von Natur nur fleiſchlich geſinnt ſein kann, ſo kann er auch aus ſich ſelbſt weiter nichts tun, als in dieſer Feindſchaft beharren, ſich darin je länger, je mehr verſteifen, verhärten, verſtocken.

Nun gibt es aber nicht nur eine Sünde der Verſtockung, ſondern nach Gottes klar geoffenbartem Wort gibt es auch ein Gericht der Verſtockung von ſeiten Gottes. „Verſtocke das Herz dieſes Volkes“, ſo ruft der HErr ſelber aus, „und laß ihre Ohren dicke ſein und blende ihre Augen, daß ſie nicht ſehen mit ihren Augen, noch hören mit ihren Ohren, noch verſtehen mit ihrem Herzen und ſich bekehren und geneſen“, Jeſ. 6, 10. Was alſo eigentlich allen Menſchen ein Geruch des Lebens zum Leben ſein ſoll, das Evangelium von der Gnade Gottes in Chriſto JEſu, das ſoll für dieſe Menſchen ſein ein Geruch des Todes zum Tode, durch welchen ſie nur um ſo tiefer ins Verderben und in die Verdammnis hineingeſtürzt werden. Was es mit dieſem Gericht der Verſtockung auf ſich habe, erkennen wir ebenfalls klar und deutlich aus der Geſchichte Pharaos.

Theo. Lätſch.

(Schluß folgt.)

Introduction to Sacred Theology.

(*Prolegomena.*)

The Nature and Constitution of Sacred Theology.

18. Theology and Academic Freedom.

Modern rationalistic theology demands that the official teachers of the Church, both in the pulpit and in the lecture chair, should be invested with full academic freedom. That is to say, they should be allowed to assert their subjective opinions without any restrictions whatsoever; even Holy Scripture must not be forced upon them as the only source and standard of the faith which they are to inculcate. The ancient Christian rule that in the Christian Church the Word of God alone must be taught is rejected as "servitude of the letter," "unworthy academic coercion," "legalism," etc. (*Buchstabenknechtschaft, unwuerdiger Lehrzwang, gesetzlicher Geist usw.*). However, this demand for academic freedom is in direct opposition to Holy Scripture; it is a freedom that is carnal and ungodly, since it involves full scope to criticize, condemn, and reject the Word of God. The academic freedom which modern rationalistic theology seeks for itself must therefore be repudiated as antichristian and atheistic, for it insists upon independence from God and Christ. As a matter of fact, the true freedom of a Christian consists in the very fact that he has been liberated from his own sin-bound will and has become a servant of Jesus Christ. Rom. 6, 22: "But now being made free from sin and become servants to God." The essence of true Christian liberty is therefore loyalty, obedience, and subjection to the Word of the Lord. John 8, 31. 32: "If ye continue in My Word, then are ye My disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." As soon as the theologian relinquishes the Word of God as his only source and norm, he ceases to be a δοῦλος Χριστοῦ, and becomes a slave of men. He has not obtained freedom at all, but has exchanged the holy service of Christ for the unholy thraldom of human opinions, views, and judgments; in place of the divine Master he now serves a human taskmaster, even if this taskmaster is only his own carnal heart. The enormity implied in the demand for free play to teach one's own subjective views in place of the infallible Word of God appears as we study the solemn demand with which Holy Scripture approaches the Christian theologian. The Word of God affirms: —

1. That the Christian Church till the end of time has only one Teacher, Christ Jesus, the Son of God. Matt. 23, 8: "But be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren." As the one Master, or Teacher, Christ commanded His apostles to teach all nations all things whatsoever He had commanded, Matt. 28, 20. Christ's own divine Word as set forth by the holy

prophets and apostles in Holy Scripture is the only saving truth which the Christian Church should believe and proclaim. Gal. 1, 8: "But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Eph. 2, 20: "And [ye] are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets." In this manner, Holy Scripture positively asserts that all teaching in the Christian Church should be nothing else than the teaching of God's Word. Negatively, Holy Scripture condemns the inculcation of human opinion in place of the Word of God by calling all those who insist upon teaching doctrine other than Christ teaches in Holy Scripture, antichrists. 1 John 2, 18: "As ye have heard that antichrists shall come, even now are there many antichrists." 2, 22: "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." The demand of modern rationalistic theology that the theologian must be given free scope to divulge his own theology is therefore thoroughly anti-Scriptural.

2. All Christians are commanded in clear and unmistakable terms to hear such teachers only as proclaim the Word of God in its complete purity and truth. All theologians who are disloyal to the "words of our Lord Jesus Christ" should be rejected as deceivers, ignoramuses, and enemies of the faith and must be avoided. 2 John 10: "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed." 1 Tim. 6, 3. 4: "If any man teach otherwise and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting." Rom. 16, 17: "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them." These warnings apply not only to ministers of the Gospel, but also to theological professors who have been called to instruct the future teachers and preachers of the Christian Church. Also their Christian call and profession requires of them that they be absolutely true to the Word of God in their whole ministry of teaching, John 8, 31. 32.

The disastrous consequences of academic freedom granted to ministers and theological professors are apparent in all churches where such freedom has been in vogue. As a result of this ungodly freedom we find in these denominations 1) hopeless confusion in doctrine and endless wrangling concerning theological problems by which these churches have been made to suffer complete disruption (cp. the denominations in which Modernists and Fundamentalists are engaged in interminable controversy); 2) the absolute denial of the basic Christian truths taught in Holy Scripture, such as the divine inspiration of the Bible, the vicarious atonement of Christ, the justification of a sinner by grace, through faith, the resurrection

of the dead, etc. Academic freedom resulted at once in "progressive theology," that is, in the liberalizing of theology according to the standards of human reason and modern science, until it has become thoroughly atheistic and agnostic in character and refuses to insist even on the heart-inscribed truths of natural religion. Present-day Modernism, which is the direct consequence of academic freedom, is a complete revolt against the sacred theology of God's Word, and the absolute rejection of Biblical Christianity.

The true Christian theologian rejoices in the possession of divine truth as offered in Holy Scripture, by which he has become free from every delusion and error. His constant endeavor is to make known to men bound and perishing in sin the saving and freeing truths of Christ, the divine Liberator of sin-lost men. Loyalty, obedience, and subjection to the Word of God constitute for him the supreme, glorious, and perfect liberty, which he must hold, guard, and protect against all odds. John 8, 36: "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." It is for this reason that he so strenuously repudiates the academic freedom which unbelieving and unfaithful theologians now demand for themselves.

19. Theological Systems.

The peculiar nature of Christian theology has given rise to the question whether it is proper in the field of theology to speak of theological systems. The answer to the question depends of course on the meaning in which the term *system* is used. Christian theology, or doctrine, is indeed a system inasmuch as it presents to the student a complete unit (*ein abgeschlossenes Ganzes*). It is a system inasmuch as it is "an orderly arrangement of parts or elements into a whole," or "an organized body of truth." The one author of Christian theology is the one, true, and living God, who proclaims the divine truth in the Old Testament as in the New Testament, by Moses no less than by Paul, so that Holy Scripture sets forth, not the subjective views of Moses, or Isaiah, or Peter, or Paul, or John, etc., but the sacred doctrine of God Himself. Scripture doctrine is everywhere and in the same degree divine doctrine (*doctrina divina*). Again, in this divine doctrine, clearly and infallibly stated in Holy Scripture, the article of justification by grace, through faith in Christ, is the central teaching, to which the other articles of faith either lead up (*articuli antecedentes*) or point back (*articuli consequentes*). 1 Cor. 2, 2: "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." Acts 20, 27: "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." In the center of Paul's preaching, which, according to his own testimony, embraced "all the counsel of God unto salvation," the doctrine of Christ, crucified for the sins of the world, was basic and pivotal. In view of this close connection of the various Christian doctrines with its central teach-

ing and with one another, a connection which is so intimate that errors in one point must inevitably produce errors also in the others, Christian theology may certainly be called a system. And we apply the term especially to point out not only the absolute unity of the whole body of truth, but also the rigid coherency of its elemental parts. Luther is right when he says: "In philosophy a small error in the beginning is a very serious error in the end. So also in theology a slight error will destroy the whole doctrine. For the doctrine is like a mathematical point; it cannot be divided, that is, it cannot brook either subtraction or addition. Hence the doctrine must be one, certain, perpetual, and round golden ring, in which there is no break. If even the least break occurs, the ring is no longer perfect." (St. Louis Ed., IX, 644 f.) Whoever, for instance, errs with respect to the Holy Trinity must err also with regard to the deity of Christ; or whoever teaches synergism cannot teach in its unadulterated form the doctrine of divine grace. Just because Christian theology is a system, it does not permit any perversion or denial of a single one of its doctrines; for every perversion of its constituent parts must needs destroy the entire system.

Nevertheless Christian theology may not be called a system in the sense in which human systems of knowledge are so called. In science and philosophy a system is "an orderly collection of logically related principles and facts, arranged so as to express the whole range of truth in any department." In that sense sacred theology is not a system; for it is not constructed by human reason on the basis of a given fundamental principle. Its author is not man, but God. In it reason has only an instrumental, not a magisterial, function (*usus instrumentalis, non usus magisterialis*). Nor does it deduce and demonstrate its truths from a given premise or principle, but it merely inculcates the truths set forth in Holy Scripture, with a proper emphasis on the cardinal doctrine of justification by grace. In other words, the analysis and synthesis which the theologian applies never go beyond the Word of God. Wherever Holy Scripture contains *lacunae,* or omissions, the system of the Christian theologian likewise contains *lacunae,* or omissions. The true theologian teaches only what Holy Scripture teaches, not more and not less. His system is only a declaration and statement of Scriptural doctrine.

This is a point of weightiest importance, and only as the theologian continually and conscientiously observes it, will he be kept from the fatal mistake of adding to the Word of God human opinions and doctrines, a perversion of Christian doctrine against which Holy Scripture most earnestly warns. Let the Christian theologian therefore bear in mind the basic truth that the system of Christian doctrine, while it is complete so far as its scope is concerned, that is, so far as it pertains to the salvation of sinners, it nevertheless contains

"missing links"; that is, there remain questions which Holy Scripture does not answer. For example, Holy Scripture sets forth most emphatically the *sola gratia* and the *universalis gratia;* that is to say, sinners are saved alone by grace, and divine grace desires the salvation of all sinners. This being true, the question arises: "Why are not all men saved?" The proposed explanation that the difference lies in men (*aliquid discrimen in homine*), since some are better than others, is most strenuously denied by God's Word, which declares that all men by nature are in the same guilt (*in eadem culpa*). Rom. 3, 22—24: "For there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." With the same emphasis Holy Scripture denies also the Calvinistic explanation that God has eternally reprobated some to damnation. Hence it is clear that Holy Scripture does not answer the question, *Cur alii, alii non?* This does not mean that Holy Scripture does not give us any information with regard to the question of salvation and damnation. It tells us clearly that, if sinners are saved, they are saved solely by grace and that, if they are lost, they are lost through their own fault. Nevertheless, when we compare two individual sinners, as David and Saul, or Peter and Judas, and ask, "Why was the one saved and the other not?" (*Cur alii prae aliis?*), this question remains unanswered. Nor is it proper for the Christian theologian to endeavor to answer the question; for in that case he must draw on human reason to decide what is properly a matter of divine revelation. Attempts to solve the particular point in question have resulted either in Calvinism, the denial of universal grace, or in synergism, the denial of grace alone. But the Christian theologian must affirm both the *universalis gratia* and the *sola gratia.* In the system of Christian doctrine therefore *lacunae,* or doctrinal "missing links," must be admitted, as St. Paul himself declares when he writes: "We know in part, and we prophesy in part," 1 Cor. 13, 9. The Christian theologian must know and teach in part only, that is, only as the divine truths, which he is to inculcate, are clearly set forth in Holy Scripture. In connection with this point we may note also the following truths: —

1. Holy Scripture is, in all its parts, the divinely inspired, infallible Word of God, in which He teaches His own way to salvation. To this way of salvation, which is both complete and perfect, the Christian theologian must add nothing, neither must he take away from it even the least particle, John 10, 35; 2 Tim. 3, 16; 2 Pet. 1, 21; John 8, 31. 32; Rev. 22, 18—20. Any change or perversion of the divine Word is a scandal, which offends God and ultimately renders impossible the salvation of sinners which God has purposed by giving His Word to men.

2. Modern rationalistic theology, which denies the fundamentals of the Christian doctrine, just because it rejects the divinely inspired Word of God as the only source and norm of faith, seeks to construct its own system of teachings (*ein einheitliches Ganzes*) on the basis of "Christian consciousness," "Christian experience," "regenerate reason," etc. In other words, it substitutes for the true *principium cognoscendi* a false standard of doctrine and dethrones Holy Scripture from its exalted eminence of being the only authority in religion. To the modern rationalistic theologian Holy Scripture is only an "authentic record" of divine revelation in which divine and human elements are blended and from which his "enlightened mind" must glean the truths that are to constitute his "system of theology." Or, to state it in different terms, modern rationalistic theology refuses to identify the Word of God with Holy Scripture, for it regards Holy Scripture only as containing the Word of God. Just what is the Word of God, or divine truth, in Holy Scripture, that, it holds, the subjective judgment of the individual theologian must decide. This procedure must be condemned as a *crimen laesae maiestatis* against the divine Lord, as a revolt against His divinely established authority, and as a downright rejection of His holy Word, which must needs result in unspeakable confusion and perversion. This is evident from the fact that the pantheistic system of Schleiermacher and the agnostic system of Ritschl, both of which are built up on the subjective authority of human reason, equally reject the Gospel of Christ and inculcate doctrines in direct opposition to it. The appeal of rationalistic theologians to "Christian consciousness," "Christian experience," and the like, as foundations of systems of faith are a mere pretense for their unholy endeavor to cast aside Holy Scripture and its divine doctrines and to teach their own word.

3. The Christian theologian, in performing his functions as a teacher of the Church, must always remember that the truths of Holy Scripture are infallible truths, which nothing can overthrow, and that it is therefore his sacred duty to present these truths just as they are set forth in Holy Scripture, without addition or subtraction. Systems of philosophy or of science are constructed by human reasoning on the basis of facts or theories gathered by the originator himself; but sacred theology is a science which God Himself, its divine Author, presents to men complete and perfect and altogether adequate for its divinely designed purpose. Hence men are to preach the Word of God and not to philosophize upon it; they are to be preachers, not demonstrators, of the truth. The Christian theologian has completely accomplished his task when he has set forth in clear view the sacred truths taught by God in Holy Scripture. Nothing more is asked of him, but also nothing less.

4. The systematizing therefore which the Christian theologian

does consists only in presenting the several divine truths given in Holy Scripture under their proper heads. These truths are derived from the proof-passages (*sedes doctrinae*), that is, from the clear and unmistakable passages in which the particular doctrines are set forth, and not from the "entirety of Scripture" or the "scope of Scripture" (*vom Schriftganzen*). The purpose of this systematizing is to present "all the counsel of God," or to teach each and every doctrine which God's Word teaches. If the theologian goes beyond this, presenting his own personal views as the teachings of God's Word, he is no longer a Christian theologian, but a false prophet.

5. The charge so frequently made that Luther himself developed his doctrines, in particular the doctrine of justification by grace, through faith, from the "scope of Scripture" (*vom Schriftganzen*), is refuted by his own statements on this score. According to his own confession the great Reformer never operated with "the scope of Scripture," but with Scripture-passages so clear and unmistakable that upon these his doctrines rested as upon an impregnable rock. It is for this reason that Luther's theology is so thoroughly Scriptural. He constructed no system of doctrine outside and beyond the written Word of God, but received and taught in simple faith the sacred truths positively set forth in the *sedes doctrinae* of Holy Scripture. He was a systematician whose whole system of doctrine was rooted in, and governed by, God's Word. He writes: "It is certain that whosoever does not rightly believe or desire one single article ... certainly does not believe any one with true earnestness and right faith. And whosoever is so presumptuous as to deny God or call Him a liar in one word [of Scripture], and does this deliberately and contrary or beyond it, ... will also deny God in all His words and in all of them call Him a liar. Therefore it is necessary to believe all and everything truly and fully or else believe nothing. The Holy Spirit does not allow Himself to be separated or divided, so that He should teach or have us believe one doctrine as true and another as false." (St. Louis Ed., XX, 1781.)

6. In conclusion it may be said that the rationalistic systems of theology, which pride themselves so smugly on their inner harmony and perfection, are after all decidedly imperfect and incomplete. They cannot be otherwise, since human reason is unable to answer in a satisfactory manner the paramount questions which properly belong to the sphere of divine revelation. In other words, unless God answers for us the questions pertaining to the great verities of spiritual knowledge, they never will be answered. Consequently, wherever the Holy Spirit, the infallible Revealer of divine truth, saw fit to be silent with respect to doctrinal issues, human reason must likewise be silent. Theologians who propose to construct complete systems of truth on the basis of their reason or their subjective

theology perpetrate a piece of fraud which is unpardonable and which leads to downright apostasy from the Word of God, to uncertainty in spiritual matters, and to endless confusion and contradiction. For all who err from Scripture err from truth in general; and the systems of doctrine which are not Scriptural are likewise not rational. For this the history of dogma furnishes abundant proof.

20. Theological Methods.

In the presentation of the dogmatic material the Lutheran divines have employed, in the main, two methods, the *synthetic* and the *analytic*. The synthetic method proceeds from cause to effect, while the analytic method pursues the opposite course, from effect to cause. Synthetically arranged, the dogmatic grouping presents, first, God, as the Cause and Principle of all things created; next, the means by which sinning and apostate humanity is brought back to communion with God; and lastly, the glorious salvation itself to which the believer attains. Analytically the dogmatic material would be grouped as follows: salvation, as the final objective of man; next, the means by which salvation is attained; and lastly, God as the divine Giver and Author of salvation. The analytical method has been preferred by the later theologians of the Lutheran Church for the avowed reason that theology, being a practical discipline, should first present man's final goal as the vital idea in Christian doctrine. After all, however, the grouping of the doctrinal material is immaterial as long as Holy Scripture is recognized as the only source and standard of faith, from which alone the theologian must draw his teachings. If the doctrine is taken from any other source than Holy Scripture, either method is alike unsatisfactory; if the theologian remains loyal to God's Word, both methods may be employed with equal success. For, after all, not the method of presenting the theological material, but faithfulness to Holy Scripture is the prime requisite of a good dogmatic treatise.

The synthetic method was commonly used within the Lutheran Church by the early dogmaticians, such as Melanchthon, Chemnitz, Hutter, Gerhard. The analytic method was followed by Dannhauer, Koenig, Calov, Quenstedt, Bayer, Hollaz, and others. Occasionally we find a combination of the two methods. The time is past when a dogmatic treatise is judged by its method, though a modified form of the synthetic method is perhaps now given the preference. But what the Christian Church must demand of all dogmatic treatises or books is a clear, thorough, and practical presentation of the Scriptural truths. The only theology which deserves a place in Christ's Church is the sacred theology which God Himself has given in Holy Writ. From this paramount treasure of divine truth the Christian theologian dare not deviate; if he does, he is disloyal to the high charge entrusted to him. In his system of theology the two distinc-

tive principles of the Christian faith, the *sola Scriptura* and the *sola gratia,* must stand preeminent; otherwise his entire theology becomes rationalistic, paganistic, and destructive, a disgrace to the name of Christ and a menace to His Church. *Quod non est biblicum, non est theologicum.* All dogma which is not founded upon this axiom does not deserve the name of Christian theology.

21. The Acquisition of the Theological Habitude.

Our Lutheran dogmaticians have rightly emphasized the great truth that "the theologian is not born, but made." (*Theologus non nascitur, sed fit.*) By this axiom they wished to say that no man by nature is a theologian nor can become a theologian by his own reason or strength. Theology is a God-given habitude. (*Theologia est habitus practicus θεόδοτος.*) Hence the Holy Spirit Himself must make a person a theologian. How the Holy Spirit accomplishes this is excellently described by Luther in the famous *dictum: Oratio, meditatio, tentatio faciunt theologum.* This is the best description of theological methodology which has ever been attempted; for it names, briefly, yet fully, all the various elements which cooperate in the making of a true theologian. It recognizes first of all the necessity of *prayer.* Of prayer as a means by which to acquire the theological habitude, Luther writes: "For this reason you should despair of your wisdom and reason; for with these you will acquire nothing, but you will by your arrogance cast yourself and others into the pit of hell, as did Lucifer; but kneel down in your chamber and ask God in true humility and seriousness to grant you His Holy Spirit through His beloved Son in order that He may enlighten you, guide you, and grant you true wisdom." (St. Louis Ed., XIV, 434 ff.) That sincere and constant prayer is an indispensable factor in the acquisition of the theological habitude is attested not only by all true theologians who have served the Christian Church in the spirit of its divine Lord, but also by Holy Scripture itself. John 15, 7. 8: "If ye abide in Me and My words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. Herein is My Father glorified that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be My disciples." 16, 24: "Ask, and ye shall receive that your joy may be full." Jas. 1, 5: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him."

The second requisite in Luther's methodology is *meditation,* or study. Of this Luther writes: "In the second place, you should meditate, and not only in your heart, but also outwardly, the oral Word and the express words which are written in the Book, which you must always consider and reconsider and read and read over with diligent attention and reflection to see what the Holy Ghost means thereby. And take care that you do not become weary of it, thinking that you have read it sufficiently if you have read, heard, or said it

once or twice, and understand it perfectly. For in this way no great theologian is made, but they [who do not study] are like immature fruit, which falls down before it is half ripe. For this reason you see in this psalm [Ps. 119] that David is always boasting that he would speak, meditate, declare, sing, hear, read, day and night and forever, yet nothing else than alone the Word and the commandments of God. For God does not purpose to give you His Spirit without the external Word. Be guided by that. For He did not command in vain to write, preach, read, hear, sing, and declare His external Word." By meditation, Luther, then, understands the constant study of Holy Scripture as the pure and infallible Word of God, by which the Holy Ghost not only converts and sanctifies sinners, but also renders the theologian capable of doing the work of a truly Christian teacher in the fear of God, in other words, by which He bestows the theological habitude. That such constant study of God's Word is commanded also in Holy Scripture is clear. 1 Tim. 4, 13: "Till I come, give attendance to reading." V. 15: "Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all." 6, 20: "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science falsely so called."

Concerning *temptation* as a means by which the Holy Spirit creates or enhances the theological habitude, Luther writes: "In the third place, there is *tentatio,* that is, trial. That is the true touchstone, which teaches you not only to know and understand, but also to experience how true, sincere, sweet, lovely, powerful, comforting, the Word of God is, so that it is the wisdom above all wisdom. Thus you see how David, in the psalm just mentioned, complains about all manner of enemies, wicked princes and tyrants, false prophets and factions, which he must endure because he always meditates, that is, deals with God's Word in every possible way, as stated. For as soon as the Word of God bears fruit through you, the devil will trouble you, make you a real teacher, and teach you through tribulation to seek and to love the Word of God. For I myself — if I am permitted to voice my humble opinion — must thank my papists very much for so buffeting, distressing, and terrifying me by the devil's fury that they made me a fairly good theologian, which otherwise I should never have become." As Luther here says, his whole theology grew out of his trials and troubles, which forced him to seek strength and comfort in Holy Scripture. And Luther experienced trials both from within and from without. First he was troubled by *tentationes* within his heart. Before he became a Christian theologian, he was plagued with the agony of a troubled conscience, produced by his insistence on work-righteousness as the means of obtaining pardon. From this state of dread and anguish he was at last rescued by the

knowledge and understanding of the blessed Gospel, from which he indeed learned how "true, sincere, sweet, lovely, and powerful the Word of God is." Afterwards, when he began to proclaim the Gospel of Christ in its purity and truth, trials came to him from without. He was stigmatized as a heretic and schismatic, not only by the Romanists, but also by the Enthusiasts of his time, so that again he was forced "to seek and love the Word," and thus he became so established in, and convinced of, the divine truth that he could say: "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise." Trials, or *tentationes,* therefore, made Luther a "fairly good theologian," because they compelled him to anchor his hope only in the Word of God. And so every Christian who aspires to become a true theologian must seek, study, and cling to, Holy Scripture until he regards it as the "wisdom above all wisdom."

Luther concludes his remarks on his famous axiom with the words: "Then [namely, if you follow the rule of David exhibited in Ps. 119] you will find how shallow and unworthy will appear to you the writings of the Fathers, and you will contemn not only the books of the opponents, but also be ever less pleased with your own preaching and writing. If you have arrived at this stage, you may surely hope that you have just begun to be a real theologian, who is able to teach not only the young and unlearned, but also the advanced and well-instructed Christians. For Christ's Church includes all manner of Christians — young, old, weak, sickly, healthy, strong, aggressive, bad, simple, wise, etc. But if you consider yourself big and imagine that you have it all and feel tickled with your booklets, preaching, and writing, as though you had done marvelously and preached wondrously, and if you are much pleased because people praise you before others and you must be praised or otherwise you are disappointed and feel like giving up, — if you are minded like that, my friend, just grab yourself by the ears, and if you grab rightly, you will find a fine pair of big, long, rough asses' ears. Then go to a little more expense and adorn yourself with golden bells, so that, wherever you go, people can hear you, admiringly point at you with their fingers, and say, 'Behold, and lo, there is that wonderful man who can write such excellent books and preach so remarkably!' Then certainly you will be blessed, yes, more than blessed, in the kingdom of heaven — indeed in that kingdom in which the fire of hell has been prepared for the devil and his angels! In fine, let us seek honor and be haughty wherever we may. In this Book, God's glory alone is set forth, and it says: *'Deus superbis resistit, humilibus autem dat gratiam.'* Amen."

Luther's emphasis upon true humility as a requisite of a true theologian is certainly in place, since the Holy Spirit with His sanctifying and strengthening gifts is present only in a contrite, humble heart. To the humble alone God gives the grace of true theology.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER.

Apoſtelamt, Predigtamt, Pfarramt, Synodalamt.

„So haben wir eine gewiſſe Lehre, daß das Predigtamt vom gemeinen Beruf der Apoſtel herkommt“, ſchreibt Luther in den Schmalkaldiſchen Artikeln, im Anhang „Von der Gewalt und Oberkeit des Papſts“, § 10, *Trigl.*, 506. Weil auch in andern Teilen dieſes Traktats die Rede iſt von verſchiedenen Ämtern in der Gemeinde und in der Kirche, ſo lohnt es ſich wohl der Mühe, die ganze Frage betreffs der Gemeinde- und Kirchenämter etwas näher anzuſehen, um darin klar zu ſehen und richtig zu unterſcheiden.

Wir unterſcheiden hier ſogleich zwiſchen der Berufung in den Jüngerkreis und der Berufung zum Apoſtelamt. Als der Heiland nach Joh. 1, 37 ff. Johannes und Andreas und dann auch Petrus, Philippus und Nathanael berief, da machte dieſer Ruf oder Beruf die Männer lediglich zu Jüngern im weiteren Sinn, zu Gläubigen, wie auch jetzt noch jeder Chriſt als Gläubiger ein Jünger JEſu iſt. Es waren dieſe fünf Jünger, die in Kana zugegen waren, als der Heiland ſein erſtes Wunder verrichtete, Joh. 2, 11. Nachdem der Heiland Kapernaum zum Mittelpunkt ſeiner galiläiſchen Wirkſamkeit gemacht hatte, berief er in einer mehr definitiven Weiſe Petrus, Andreas, Jakobus und Johannes als permanente Mitarbeiter, als Menſchenfiſcher, Matth. 4, 18—22; Mark. 1, 16—20; Luk. 5, 1—11. Wie es ſcheint, wurde Matthäus ſofort und direkt als Mitarbeiter am Reich berufen, Matth. 9, 9.

Die formelle Berufung der ſogenannten zwölf Jünger in das Apoſtelamt aber fand ſtatt, als der Heiland ſie nach einer im Gebet verbrachten Nacht feierlich zu ſich rief und ihnen ihren beſonderen Auftrag auf die Seele band, Matth. 10, 1 ff.; Mark. 6, 7 ff.; Luk. 6, 12 ff. Es waren auch dieſe Zwölf, die mit beſonderen Wundergaben ausgeſtattet wurden, um ſo der Predigt vom Reich Gottes rechten Nachdruck zu verleihen, Luk. 9, 1 ff. Das Verhältnis der Zwölf zum Heiland als Meiſter und HErr wird in den letzten Kapiteln der Synoptiker und auch im Johannesevangelium immer wieder betont, beſonders in den Berichten von der Leidenswoche, Luk. 9, 3 ff.; Mark. 14, 17. 20. Von ganz beſonderer Wichtigkeit für das rechte Verſtändnis des Apoſtelamts ſind die Stellen Joh. 14, 26; 15, 26. 27; 16, 13. 14; 17, 14. 18. 20. Daß die Zwölfzahl mit Abſicht gewählt wurde, geht hervor aus Apoſt. 1, 15 ff., wo auch die Bedingungen der Nomination für die vakante Apoſtelſtelle angegeben ſind, V. 21. Daß endlich der Apoſtel Paulus durch einen ganz beſonderen Beruf zu ſeinem Amte ausgerüſtet wurde, geht nicht nur aus der Beſchreibung ſeiner Bekehrung hervor, Apoſt. 9; 22; 26, ſondern auch aus den vielen Stellen, in denen er ſein Amt verteidigt und rühmt, Gal. 1, 12—16; 2, 8; 2 Kor. 12, 11.

Was müſſen wir uns nun betreffs des Dienſtes der Apoſtel merken? Sie hatten einmal einen beſonderen Beruf ihres Meiſters, und zwar einen unmittelbaren und direkten Beruf. Das gilt ſogar

von der Wahl des Matthias; denn die Jünger stellten ausdrücklich das Fallen des Loses in die Hand des HErrn, Apost. 1, 24. 26. Die Zwölf sind sämtlich in ihr Amt als Apostel eingesetzt worden. — Und ihr Dienst (διακονία) wird ausdrücklich ein Amt genannt. Der Apostel schreibt Röm. 1, 5, daß er durch Christum empfangen habe Gnade und Apostelamt (χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν), woraus klar hervorgeht, daß die Schrift selber unterscheidet zwischen einer bloßen Gnadengabe und dem Apostelamt, das ja hier infolge des Zusatzes als etwas schon Vorhandenes erscheint, das jemandem gegeben werden kann. Wir denken hier auch an 1 Kor. 9, 16. 17, wo Paulus ausdrücklich sagt, daß ihm sein Amt befohlen worden sei. Es kann darum kein Zweifel sein, daß das Apostelamt wirklich als ein von Gott gestiftetes Amt anzusehen ist, nicht als eine bloße Tätigkeit der freien christlichen Liebe, die eben auch ihre Aufgabe darin sieht, das Zeugnis von Christo zu verbreiten.

Wenn nun die oben angeführte Stelle aus den Schmalkaldischen Artikeln erklärt, daß das Predigtamt vom allgemeinen Beruf der Apostel herkommt, daß das spezielle Predigtamt der Jetztzeit *in wesentlichen Stücken* identisch ist mit dem Amte der Apostel im eigentlichen Sinn, so ist das ganz im Einklang mit der Schrift geredet. Die Ämter werden in der Schrift nicht identifiziert; aber es wird gezeigt, daß sie in ihrer Aufgabe und in ihrem Zweck identisch sind. Die Apostel stellen sich den andern Dienern und Verkündigern des Wortes an die Seite: 1 Kor. 4, 1 (vgl. mit V. 6); 1 Tim. 4, 6; Kol. 4, 7; Phil. 2, 25; 1 Petr. 5, 1; 1 Kor. 3, 5; Apost. 15, 22. Wie die Apostel lehren, mahnen, weiden, Joh. 21, 15—17; 2 Tim. 2, 2; 1, 11, so auch die Ältesten und Bischöfe, Apost. 20, 28; 2 Tim. 2, 2; Tit. 1, 9; 1 Petr. 5, 2; Hebr. 13, 14. Die Vollmacht beider Ämter ist offenbar dieselbe, Luk. 10, 16; Matth. 10, 40; Hebr. 13, 17. Allerdings achten wir bei Betonung der wesentlichen Identität der beiden Ämter auch auf die besonderen Vorzüge und Vorrechte des Apostelamtes, indem wir nicht nur auf die oben angeführten Bedingungen für die Auswahl der Männer sehen, sondern auch auf ihre besondere Befähigung und auf den Skopus ihres Amtes. Sie waren in ihrer eigenen Person die von Gott bestimmten Lehrer der ganzen Welt; durch sie hat Gott der Heilige Geist direkt geredet; ihr Wort, das mit dem der Propheten des Alten Testaments auf *eine* Stufe gestellt wird, Eph. 2, 20; 3, 3—5; 1 Petr. 1, 12, ist Fundament der ganzen neutestamentlichen evangelischen Verkündigung. Diese besonderen Vorzüge gelten nicht vom Gemeindeamt, welches doch sonst in ganz unbefangener Weise als διακονία bezeichnet wird. Summa: Während *das Apostolat* in einigen Stücken sui generis war (Inspiration, Lehrer der ganzen Welt bis an das Ende der Tage), so ist es doch *mit dem jetzigen Amt des Wortes in der christlichen Gemeinde identisch in allen wesentlichen Stücken*.

Wie steht es nun aber mit dem Begriff *Predigtamt*, den man

bis jetzt ziemlich promiscue im weiteren und im engeren Sinn gebraucht hat? Wenn wir genau unterſcheiden, auch gerade auf Grund der Ausführungen der Schrift, auf die ſich Luther an vielen Stellen beruft, ſo faſſen wir das Wort Predigtamt als identiſch mit den Funktionen des allgemeinen Prieſtertums aller Gläubigen, wie ſie im großen Miſſionsbefehl und an andern Stellen genannt ſind. Dies wird in der Dogmatik das Predigtamt in abstracto genannt. Vom Predigtamte in abstracto redet die Auguſtana in Artikel V: „Solchen Glauben zu erlangen, hat Gott das Predigtamt eingeſetzt, Evangelium und Sakramente gegeben, dadurch er, als durch Mittel, den Heiligen Geiſt gibt, welcher den Glauben, wo und wann er will, in denen, ſo das Evangelium hören, wirkt." (*Trigl.*, 44.)

Der allgemeine Miſſionsbefehl, Matth. 28, 19. 20, iſt an alle Chriſten aller Zeiten gerichtet: „Machet zu Jüngern alle Völker, indem ihr ſie tauft in den Namen des Vaters und des Sohnes und des Heiligen Geiſtes, indem ihr ſie lehrt zu halten [bewahren] alles, was ich euch als Auftrag gegeben habe." Ebenſo Mark. 16, 15: „Prediget das Evangelium der ganzen Kreatur." Dieſer Befehl beruht auf der Tatſache, daß alle Gläubigen Prieſter des Neuen Teſtaments ſind, wie das in gewaltiger Weiſe 1 Petr. 2, 9; Offenb. 1, 6; 5, 10 dargelegt wird. Das allgemeine Prieſtertum der Gläubigen ſchließt in ſich alle Vorrechte, die den Chriſten kraft ihres Gnadenſtandes in ihrer Beziehung zu einander gehören, ausgenommen nur die öffentliche Ausübung der Schlüſſelgewalt, das heißt, von Gemeinſchafts wegen. Wenn alſo Kol. 3, 16 geſagt wird: „Laſſet das Wort Chriſti unter euch reichlich wohnen in aller Weisheit. Lehret und vermahnet euch ſelbſt mit Pſalmen und Lobgeſängen und geiſtlichen lieblichen Liedern", und wenn es Jak. 5, 16 heißt: „Bekenne einer dem andern ſeine Sünden und betet für einander", ſo iſt da ebenſowohl von den Funktionen des geiſtlichen Prieſtertums geredet wie in Matth. 18, 15: „Sündiget dein Bruder an dir, ſo gehe hin und ſtrafe ihn zwiſchen dir und ihm allein. Höret er dich, ſo haſt du deinen Bruder gewonnen."

Trefflich wird dieſe Wahrheit dargelegt von Luther, und zwar in vielen ſeiner Schriften. In ſeiner Auslegung von Pſ. 110, 4 ſchreibt der große Reformator: „So wir aber Chriſten worden ſind durch dieſen Prieſter und ſein Prieſteramt [nämlich durch Chriſtum] und in der Taufe durch den Glauben ihm eingeleibt, ſo kriegen wir auch das Recht und Macht, das Wort, ſo wir von ihm haben, zu lehren und zu bekennen vor jedermann, ein jeglicher nach ſeinem Beruf und Stande. Denn ob wir wohl nicht alle im öffentlichen Amt und Beruf ſind, ſo ſoll und mag doch ein jeglicher Chriſt ſeinen Nächſten lehren, unterrichten, vermahnen, tröſten, ſtrafen durch Gottes Wort, wann und wo jemand das bedarf, als Vater und Mutter ihre Kinder und Geſinde, ein Bruder, Nachbar, Bürger oder Bauer den andern. Denn es kann ja ein Chriſt der Zehn Gebote, des Glaubens, Gebets uſw. den andern, ſo noch unverſtändig

oder schwach ist, unterrichten oder vermahnen, und der es hört, schuldig ist, solches auch als Gottes Wort von ihm anzunehmen und mit öffentlich zu bekennen." (V, 1038.) Und in seiner Schrift „Daß eine christliche Versammlung oder Gemeinde Recht und Macht habe, alle Lehre zu urteilen und Lehrer zu berufen, ein- und abzusetzen: Grund und Ursache aus der Schrift" lesen wir: „Daß hier abermals gewiß ist, daß ein Christ nicht allein Recht und Macht hat, das Wort Gottes zu lehren, sondern ist dasselbe zu tun schuldig bei seiner Seelen Verlust und Gottes Ungnade. So sprichst du: Ja, wie? wenn er nicht dazu berufen ist, so darf er ja nicht predigen, wie du selbst so oft gelehrt hast? Antwort: Hier sollst du den Christen in zweierlei Orte stellen. Aufs erste, wenn er ist an dem Ort, da keine Christen sind, da bedarf er keines andern Berufs, denn daß er ein Christ ist, inwendig von Gott berufen und gesalbt; da ist er schuldig, den irrenden Heiden oder Unchristen zu predigen und zu lehren das Evangelium aus Pflicht christlicher Liebe, ob ihn schon kein Mensch dazu beruft. . . . Denn in solchem Fall sieht ein Christ aus brüderlicher Liebe die Not der armen verdorbenen Seelen an und wartet nicht, ob ihm Befehl oder Brief von Fürsten oder Bischöfen gegeben werde; denn Not bricht alle Gesetze und hat kein Gesetz; so ist die Liebe schuldig zu helfen, wo sonst niemand ist, der hilft oder helfen sollte." (X, 1544.) Und einige Paragraphen vorher betont Luther das Recht der Christen, die Lehre zu beurteilen, wenn er schreibt: „Hier siehest du je klar, wes das Recht ist, zu urteilen die Lehre [nämlich in Joh. 10, 4. 8]. Bischöfe, Papst, Gelehrten und jedermann hat Macht zu lehren; aber die Schafe sollen urteilen, ob sie Christi Stimme lehren oder der Fremden Stimme." (X, 1541.)

Und gerade auch die Beziehung des allgemeinen Priestertums zu dem Amt von Gemeinschafts wegen wird von Luther betont, wenn er z. B. in seiner Schrift „Wie man Kirchendiener wählen und einsetzen soll" vom Jahre 1523 schreibt: „Wir bestehen fest auf dem, daß kein ander Wort Gottes ist denn das allein, das allen Christen zu verkündigen geboten wird; daß nicht eine andere Taufe ist denn die, die alle Christen geben mögen; daß kein ander Gedächtnis ist des Abendessens des HErrn denn das, so ein jeder Christ begehen mag . . .; auch daß keine andere Sünde ist, denn die ein jeder Christ binden und auflösen mag; item, daß kein Opfer sei denn der Leib eines jeden Christenmenschen; daß auch niemand beten kann oder möge denn allein der Christ; dazu daß niemand urteilen soll über die Lehre denn allein der Christ. Diese sind aber je die priesterlichen und königlichen Ämter." Und dann sagt er von der Verleihung des Gemeindeamtes zur Ausübung dieser Rechte von Gemeinschafts wegen: „So nun das Amt des Wortes einem verliehen wird, so werden ihm auch verliehen alle Ämter, die durch das Wort in der Kirche werden ausgerichtet, das ist, die Gewalt zu taufen, zu segnen, zu binden und zu lösen, zu beten und zu richten oder urteilen." (X, 1590. 1592.) Und in seiner Aus-

legung von 2 Moſ. 3, 1 ſchreibt Luther: „Das iſt der Beruf eines öffentlichen Amts unter den Chriſten. Wenn man aber unter den Haufen käme, da nicht Chriſten wären, da möchte man tun wie die Apoſtel und nicht warten des Berufs. Denn man hat da nicht das Amt zu predigen; und einer ſpräche: Allhier ſind nicht Chriſten, ich will predigen und ſie unterrichten vom Chriſtentum, und es ſchlüge ſich ein Haufe zuſammen, erwähleten und berufeten mich zu ihrem Biſchofe, da hätte ich einen Beruf.“ (III, 723.)

Hiermit hat Luther auch ſchon in klarer Weiſe den Unterſchied zwiſchen dem allgemeinen Prieſtertum aller Gläubigen oder dem Predigtamt *in abstracto* und dem Predigtamt *in concreto*, dem Gemeinde- oder Pfarramt, gegeben, den Unterſchied, den wir nach der Schrift durchaus feſthalten müſſen, wenn wir die Rechte der Chriſten wahren wollen. Daß wir es hier nämlich mit einem von Gott geſtifteten Amt und nicht mit einer bloß kirchlichen Einrichtung zu tun haben, geht klar aus der Schrift hervor. Es wird nicht nur von dem Apoſtelamt im eigentlichen Sinne, ſowie von dem beſonderen Amt der Propheten und dem der Evangeliſten der erſten Kirche geſagt, daß Gott ſie geſetzt habe, Eph. 4, 11, ſondern eben auch von den Hirten und Lehrern, *τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους*, die eben zu jener Zeit und ſeit jener Zeit den einzelnen Gemeinden vorſtanden. Vgl. 1 Kor. 12, 28, wo die beſonderen Lehrer der apoſtoliſchen Zeit und die Gemeindelehrer aller Zeiten mit der eigentlichen Amtsbezeichnung aufgeführt werden, während ſonſtige Charismata mit abſtrakten Bezeichnungen genannt werden.

Wir richten unſer Augenmerk in dieſem Zuſammenhang beſonders auf die Stellen, die ausdrücklich auf das **eine** Gemeindeamt gehen, das Gott geſtiftet hat, wie Tit. 1, 5; 2 Tim. 2, 2; 1 Tim. 3, 1 ff.; Apoſt. 14, 23; 20, 25—31; 1 Tim. 5, 22. Es handelt ſich in dieſen Stellen um ganz beſtimmte Diener am Wort, um Männer, die einem nicht von allen Chriſten verwalteten Amt vorſtehen, 1 Tim. 3, 1; die durch gehörige Ausbildung in den Stand geſetzt worden ſind, dies Amt zu verwalten, 2 Tim. 2, 2; 1 Tim. 5, 22, und, ſofern ſie nicht an Heiden arbeiten, wie in dem Fall von Evangeliſten, beſtimmten Gemeinden vorſtehen, Apoſt. 20, 28; 1 Petr. 5, 2; Tit. 1, 5; Apoſt. 14, 23. Auch wird betont, daß die ſo berufenen Männer von den betreffenden Gemeinden ihren Lebensunterhalt empfangen ſollten, 1 Kor. 9, 14; 1 Tim. 5, 17. 18. Der Kontext in all dieſen Stellen zwingt zu der Annahme, daß es ſich in dieſen Fällen nicht um einen bloßen apoſtoliſchen Rat handelt, ſondern um einen Befehl Gottes, der für die Kirche aller Zeiten verbindlich iſt. Wie das Apoſtolat, ſo iſt das Hirten- und Lehramt eine Gabe Chriſti, ein Amt, das der HErr ſich eingerichtet, beſtimmt, eingeſetzt, verordnet hat.

Dies geht ferner daraus hervor, daß Gemeinden und Biſchöfe, Älteſte oder Hirten-Lehrer immer in Wechſelbeziehung zueinander

stehen. Allerdings ist eine Gemeinde eine christliche Gemeinde auch vor Bestellung des öffentlichen Gemeinde- oder Pfarramts; aber das Amt ist wesentlich für die Ausübung der allen Christen gegebenen Rechte und Pflichten von Gemeinschafts wegen. Eben aus diesem Grunde hat Gott das Verhältnis zwischen den Bischöfen oder Pfarrherren und ihren Gemeinden so genau geordnet, wie aus den angegebenen Schriftstellen ersichtlich ist. Und Gott fordert die gewissenhafte Erfüllung dieser Pflichten auf beiden Seiten, Hebr. 13, 17; 1 Petr. 5, 4. Auch das Wort Christi Luk. 10, 16 gehört hierher sowie 1 Thess. 5, 12. 13; 4, 8; Phil. 2, 28—30. Weil es sich um ein von Gott gestiftetes Amt handelt, redet unser Bekenntnis (Augustana, XIV, De Ordine Ecclesiastico) so bestimmt: „Vom Kirchenregiment wird gelehrt, daß niemand in der Kirche öffentlich lehren oder predigen oder Sakramente reichen soll ohne ordentlichen Beruf." (*Trigl.*, 48.) Und in der Apologie steht klar und deutlich: „Wo man das Sakrament des Ordens wollte nennen ein Sakrament von dem Predigtamt und Evangelio, so hätte es keine Beschwerung, die Ordination ein Sakrament zu nennen. Denn das Predigtamt hat Gott eingesetzt und geboten (ministerium Verbi habet mandatum Dei)." (*Trigl.*, 310, § 11.)

Alle diese Wahrheiten hat auch Luther des öfteren in meisterhafter Weise ausgeführt. Wir führen nur einige Zitate an. In seiner zweiten Auslegung des 110. Psalms schreibt Luther: „Ob wir wohl alle Priester sind, so können und sollen wir doch darum nicht alle predigen oder lehren und regieren; doch muß man aus dem ganzen Haufen etliche aussondern und wählen, denen solches Amt befohlen werde. Und wer solches führt, der ist nun nicht des Amts halben ein Priester (wie die andern alle sind), sondern ein Diener der andern aller. Und wenn er nicht mehr predigen und dienen kann oder will, so tritt er wieder in den gemeinen Haufen, befiehlt das Amt einem andern und ist nichts anders denn ein jeglicher gemeiner Christ." (V, 1037.) In seiner gewaltigen Schrift „An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation, von des christlichen Standes Besserung" finden sich folgende Sätze: „Ich sage also, daß nach Christi und der Apostel Einsetzung eine jegliche Stadt einen Pfarrherrn oder Bischof soll haben, wie klärlich Paulus schreibt, Tit. 1, 6. . . . Ich will reden von dem Pfarrstand, den Gott eingesetzt hat, der eine Gemeinde mit Predigen und Sakramenten regieren muß, bei ihnen wohnen und zeitlich haushalten." (X, 314 f.) Und in der andern gewaltigen Schrift vom Jahre 1520, „Von der babylonischen Gefangenschaft der Kirche", lesen wir: „Darum soll ein jeder, der ein Christ sein will, gewiß sein und bei sich wohl erwägen, daß wir alle gleicherweise Priester sind, das ist, daß wir gleiche Gewalt an dem Worte Gottes und einem jeden Sakrament haben, doch daß es sich nicht für einen jeden gebühre, sich derselben zu gebrauchen, es sei denn aus Verwilligung der Gemeinde oder durch Beruf der Oberen. Denn was aller insgemein ist,

kann niemand insonderheit an sich ziehen, bis er dazu berufen wird." (XIX, 117.)

Aus dieser Stellung Luthers, der sich die lutherische Kirche im großen und ganzen immer angeschlossen hat, geht hervor, daß die allen Christen gehörigen Vorrechte der Verkündigung des Wortes und der Administration der Sakramente, überhaupt der Verwaltung des Amts der Schlüssel, durch den Beruf der Gemeinde an den Diener am Wort übertragen werden, nämlich zur Verwaltung dieser Funktionen von Gemeinschafts wegen. Von den ältesten der Gemeinde zu Ephesus hören wir, daß sie die ganze Herde weiden sollten, unter welche der Heilige Geist sie gesetzt hatte zu Bischöfen, Apost. 20, 28. Und es kann kein Zweifel sein, daß sie ihr Amt in etwa derselben Weise überkommen und empfangen haben, wie die Männer, die unter der Aufsicht des Paulus und Barnabas in den verschiedenen galatischen Gemeinden in ihr Amt eingesetzt wurden. (Vgl. zu der Stelle Luther, XIX, 347, sowie Pieper, Christliche Dogmatik, III, 514 ff.) Dasselbe gilt von Tit. 1, 5, wo dem Titus anbefohlen wird, daß er dafür sorgen solle, daß die Gemeinden städteweise Prediger oder Pfarrer erhalten. Auch sollte man nicht solche Stellen übersehen wie Kol. 4, 17, wo dem Archippus, der augenscheinlich Bischof der Gemeinde zu Kolossä war, gesagt wird: „Siehe auf das Amt, das du empfangen hast in dem HErrn, daß du es ausrichtest." Vgl. Philem. 2.

Der Abschnitt über Gemeindeämter wäre kaum vollständig ohne Bezugnahme auf die Hilfsämter des Gemeinde- oder Pfarramtes innerhalb der Gemeinde. Es ist ja nur dies eine Amt von Gott gestiftet und gesetzt, und den Inhabern dieses einen Amtes bindet Gott zu aller Zeit die Verantwortlichkeit für die ganze Herde, für die ganze Gemeinde Gottes an dem Ort, auf die Seele, wie das klar aus Apost. 20, 28; 1 Tim. 3, 5; 1 Thess. 5, 12. 13; Hebr. 13, 17 und andern Stellen hervorgeht.

Dabei steht es aber in der christlichen Freiheit und Weisheit der einzelnen Gemeinde, nach apostolischem Vorbild ihrem berufenen Diener am Wort Gehilfen zur Seite zu stellen. Die Schrift redet Röm. 12, 6 ff. von mancherlei Charismata, nicht nur des Lehrens und des Weissagens, sondern auch des Ermahnens, des Gebens, des Regierens, und 1 Kor. 12, 28 von Kräften, von der Fähigkeit, Beistand zu leisten, zu regieren, verschiedene Sprachen zu beherrschen. Diese Stellen sind zunächst an einzelne Gemeinden gerichtet, und sie sind auch von jeher in einzelnen Gemeinden ausgeübt worden. Wir lesen Apost. 6 von besonderen Almosenpflegern, die von der Gemeinde gewählt und installiert wurden, hauptsächlich um einem Notstande abzuhelfen. Es scheint fast, als ob das Amt dieser Männer mit der Zersprengung der Gemeinde nach dem Tode des Stephanus sein Ende gefunden habe; denn wir finden einen von ihnen, Philippus, im Jahre 58 als Evangelisten in Cäsarien, Apost. 21, 8. Daß dagegen das Amt der ältesten weiterbe-

stand und daß diese später wieder die Funktionen der Almosenpflege übernahmen, scheint aus Apost. 11, 30 hervorzugehen. Ein ähnliches Amt wie das der Almosenpfleger in Jerusalem war etwas später das der Diakonen, von denen 1 Tim. 3, 8—10. 12. 13 die Rede ist. 1 Tim. 5, 17 werden lehrende Presbyter neben nichtlehrenden oder mitregierenden Ältesten genannt. Weibliche Diakonen oder Diakonissen werden genannt 1 Tim. 3, 10 und Röm. 16, 16. Ein Witweninstitut wird gewöhnlich auf Grund von 1 Tim. 5, 9 und zuweilen auch auf Grund von Tit. 2, 3 ff. angenommen. Soweit sich ermitteln läßt, kann nicht nachgewiesen werden, daß sich schon im ersten Jahrhundert ein besonderes Dienstamt der Katecheten fand, die etwa mit unsern Gemeindeschullehrern auf eine Stufe zu stellen wären. Ämter dieser Art, zu denen sich in den folgenden Jahrhunderten noch viele andere gesellten, wurden von den Gemeinden eingerichtet, wie diese es eben nach den Umständen in rechter praktischer Weisheit für nötig fanden.

Damit ist uns schon ein Fingerzeig gegeben, daß wir unter gegebenen Umständen und Verhältnissen ebenfalls besondere Gnadengaben in den Dienst der Gemeinde stellen können, nämlich durch Kreierung von Hilfsämtern, die dem Pfarramte dienend zur Seite stehen. Die Tätigkeit solcher Ämter ist vor kurzem fein zusammengestellt worden in den folgenden Sätzen:[1] „Ein Vorsteher z. B. soll dem Pastor in der Aufsicht über die ganze Gemeinde ein Helfer sein; aber die öffentliche Verwaltung des Wortes und der Sakramente ist ihm nicht übertragen. Ein Diakon oder eine Diakonissin soll sich der Armen und Kranken annehmer als Helfer des Pastors; aber darüber hinaus geht der Umfang oder die Grenze seines oder ihres Berufes nicht. Ein Schullehrer ist zum Unterricht und zur Erziehung der Kinder in Gottes Wort berufen; aber darüber hinaus geht sein Beruf als Lehrer der Schulkinder nicht, es sei denn, daß die Gemeinde in ihrem Beruf ihm noch andere Betätigung aufträgt, z. B. Leitung des Kirchenchors, Unterricht im Lesen, Schreiben und in andern weltlichen Unterrichtsgegenständen. Dabei ist es der dem Lehrer aufgetragene Dienst im christlichen Unterricht und in christlicher Erziehung der ihm von Gott anvertrauten Kinder, der den eigentlichen Inhalt seines Berufes als Gemeindeschullehrer bildet. . . . Und über die in der Berufungsurkunde geforderte und dem Berufenen aufgetragene Tätigkeit geht auch der Umfang des Lehrerberufes nicht hinaus. Wollte ein Schullehrer diese Grenzen überschreiten, so würde er etwas tun, wozu weder Gott noch die Gemeinde ihn berufen hat, ja was Gott 1 Petr. 4, 15 verboten hat. Auch ein göttlicher Beruf geht nicht weiter, als die in demselben geforderten amtlichen Verrichtungen gehen." Wir könnten hier noch die Arbeit eines Hilfspastors nennen, der in der Regel für das ganze Amt vorgebildet ist, aber nur solche Funktionen übernimmt, die ihm explicite oder doch implicite von der Gemeinde direkt oder indirekt aufgetragen werden.

---

1) L. A. Heerboth, im *Lutheran School Journal*, Vol. 67, 52.

Wir können es uns hier nicht verſagen, noch einige Zeugniſſe aus Luther anzuführen. Er ſagt in ſeiner Schrift „Wie man Kirchendiener wählen und einſetzen ſoll“: „So nun das Amt des Wortes einem verliehen wird, ſo werden ihm verliehen auch alle Ämter, die durch das Wort in der Kirche werden ausgerichtet, das iſt, die Gewalt zu taufen, zu ſegnen, zu binden und zu löſen, zu beten und zu richten oder urteilen. Denn das Amt, zu predigen das Evangelium, iſt das höchſte unter allen; denn es iſt das rechte apoſtoliſche Amt, das den Grund legt allen andern Ämtern, welchen allen zugehört, auf das erſte zu bauen, als da ſind die Ämter der Lehrer, der Propheten, der Regierer. . . . Paulus rühmte ſich auch, daß er nicht geſandt ſei zu taufen, als zu einem geringeren und nachfolgenden Amt, ſondern daß er geſandt ſei das Evangelium zu predigen, als zu dem vornehmſten Amt, 1 Kor. 1, 17.“ (X, 1592.) Ähnlich in der Schrift „Daß eine chriſtliche Verſammlung Recht und Macht habe“ uſw. vom Jahre 1523: „Darum, wem das Predigtamt [in dem Sinne von Pfarramt] aufgelegt wird, dem wird das höchſte Amt aufgelegt in der Chriſtenheit; derſelbe mag darnach auch taufen, Meß halten und alle Seelſorge tragen; oder ſo er nicht will, mag er an dem Predigen allein bleiben und Taufe und andere Unterämter andern laſſen, wie Chriſtus tat und Paulus und andere Apoſtel, Apoſt. 6.“ (X, 1548.) Und in ſeiner Schrift „Von der babyloniſchen Gefangenſchaft der Kirche“: „Das Diakonenamt aber iſt ein Dienſt, nicht das Evangelium oder die Epiſtel zu leſen, wie heutzutage gebräuchlich iſt, ſondern die Kirchengüter den Armen auszuteilen, damit die Prieſter, von der Laſt der zeitlichen Güter entledigt, mit dem Gebet und dem Worte Gottes deſto freier anhalten möchten. Denn in dieſer Abſicht, wie wir Apoſt. 6, 3 leſen, ſind die Diakonen eingeſetzt worden.“ (XIX, 117 f.)

In dieſer ganzen Ausführung dürfen wir nicht vergeſſen, daß die in der Schrift für die Inhaber des Pfarramtes geforderten Qualifikationen, ceteris paribus, auch für die Inhaber aller Hilfsämter gelten (z. B. das διδακτικός für alle, die lehren) ſowie daß durch ſolche Hilfsämter die Pflichten des Paſtors als Seelſorger wohl vermindert, aber nicht aufgehoben werden können. Er iſt nach wie vor Biſchof und Seelſorger der ganzen Gemeinde. Darum reden wir auch genauer von Hilfsämtern als von Zweigämtern. Das Pfarramt iſt als ſolches, in ſeiner Geſtalt als Amt, von Gott gewollt und geſtiftet, was von keinem andern Amt in der Kirche behauptet werden kann; es iſt alſo im beſonderen und engeren Sinn ein göttliches Amt.

Dies muß auch feſtgehalten werden, wenn wir ſchließlich noch kurz auf Synodalämter zu reden kommen. Wie die Synode als ſolche eine freie menſchliche, eine rein kirchliche Einrichtung iſt, durch die aber doch die einzelnen Gemeinden nach apoſtoliſchem Vorbild gewiſſe Pflichten in der Regel leichter und vorteilhafter ausrichten können, als ſie das für ſich allein vermöchten, ſo ſteht es auch mit den Ämtern der Synode. Die

materia ist vielfach in der Schrift gegeben oder angedeutet, die forma steht frei. Das Gemeinde- oder Pfarramt ist seinem Umfang (nämlich insofern der Pastor der ganzen Gemeinde dient), seinem Wesen und Inhalt nach von Gott geordnet; hingegen für die Aufrichtung und Einrichtung anderer Lehr- und Regierämter hat Gott die Form usw. nicht bestimmt, also in die Freiheit der christlichen Gemeinde, resp. der Gemeinden, die eine Synode bilden, gestellt.

Wir unterscheiden hier zwischen Ämtern, die lediglich der Synodalorganisation dienen, wobei aber auch von Gott geschenkte Charismata in Betracht kommen, und solchen, bei denen die materia in Gottes Wort durch Auftrag und Exempel gegeben, die forma aber freigelassen ist. Zu der ersten Klasse gehören besonders die Regierämter der Präsides, der Vizepräsides und der Visitatoren; denn die Regiergabe ist ein Charisma nicht nur in der einzelnen Gemeinde, sondern auch in einem Synodalkörper, Röm. 12, 8; 1 Kor. 12, 28 (κυβερνήσεις). Zu der zweiten Klasse gehören die Lehrer an den Hochschulen einer Synode, die die Ausbildung von jungen Männern für den Dienst des Wortes leiten. Auch hier kommen besondere, in der Schrift genannte Charismata zur Geltung, auf Grund der Apostelworte: „Er ist aufgefahren in die Höhe und hat den Menschen Gaben gegeben . . ., dadurch der Leib Christi erbauet werde", Eph. 4, 8. 11. 12. Und abermal: „Es sind mancherlei Gaben, aber es ist ein Geist. . . . In einem jeglichen erzeigen sich die Gaben des Geistes zum gemeinen Nutzen. Einem wird gegeben durch den Geist, zu reden von der Weisheit, . . . einem andern mancherlei Sprachen, einem andern, die Sprachen auszulegen, . . . Helfer, Regierer, mancherlei Sprachen", 1 Kor. 12, 4. 7. 10. 28. Wohl nicht in dem ersten und eminenten Sinn, jedenfalls aber in einem abgeleiteten Sinn gilt von den Inhabern dieser Ämter, daß sie ein göttliches Amt führen, einen göttlichen Beruf haben; und wir können wohl die Worte Walthers unterschreiben, wenn er von den Männern, die gottselige Knaben erziehen und unterrichten, damit sie einst das Amt, das die Versöhnung predigt, zu führen vermögen, sagt, daß sie ein heiliges, göttliches Amt inne haben. Aber wir sind uns dabei bewußt, daß wir es bei diesem Amt mit einem Zweig des Predigtamtes, nicht des Pfarramtes im eigentlichen Sinne, zu tun haben. Wenn wir darauf achten, daß die Funktion der Vorbereitung zum Dienst am Wort in der Schrift 2 Tim. 2, 2 gegeben ist und daß christliche Gemeinden schon kraft ihrer Prärogative der übertragung des Gemeindeamtes an dazu tüchtige junge Männer verpflichtet sind, auf deren Ausbildung zu achten, so werden wir ohne Zweifel die hohe Wichtigkeit des Lehramtes an unsern Hochschulen recht einschätzen. Weiter als dies zu gehen, sind wir aber kaum berechtigt. Die Charismata sind verheißen, die einzelnen Ämter aber nicht gestiftet, noch direkt befohlen. Wo immer es in der Geschichte der Kirche Gemeinden gegeben hat, da hat es nach Gottes Ordnung Pastoren oder Pfarrer gegeben; denn die Ge-

meinde und das Amt sind Korrelate. Alle andern Ämter sind gemeindliche oder kirchliche Einrichtungen, die in der einzelnen Gemeinde Hilfsämter des Pfarramtes, die in der Synode Hilfsämter des Predigtamtes, mit gewissen Einstellungen zu den Pflichten der Einzelgemeinde dem Pfarramte gegenüber.[2] P. E. Kretzmann.

Studies in Hosea 1—3.

Chapter I.

V. 2. The beginning of the word of the Lord "by Hosea." The preposition rendered "by," בְּ, may mean either *to*, as Zech. 1, 9. 14; 2, 2. 7; Num. 12, 8; or *by*, as Num. 12, 2. 6; 1 Kings 2, 28. Here either meaning would suit the context. Since the prophet immediately reports a word which the Lord spoke *to* him, a command given *to* him, בְּ here may mean *"to."* Since, however, the prophet here speaks of the beginning of his prophetic office, and since in the next clause ("the

2) Schriften und Stellen in Luthers Werken, die bei Behandlung der Frage von Kirche und Amt berücksichtigt worden sind: Von den Konziliis und Kirchen, XVI, 2269 ff.; Antwort auf das überchristliche Buch Emsers, XVIII, 1281 ff. 1347 ff.; Wider die himmlischen Propheten, XX, 282 f.; Vom Papsttum zu Rom, gegen Alveld, XVIII, 1021; Von der Winkelmesse und Pfaffenweihe, XIX, 1257 ff.; Wie man Kirchendiener wählen und einsetzen soll, X, 1557 f. 1572. 1580 ff.; Wider Hans Wurst, XVII, 1322 ff.; Einleitung zur Offenbarung, XIV, 138; Von der Beichte, ob der Papst Macht habe usw., XIX, 845 ff.; Daß eine christliche Versammlung oder Gemeinde Recht und Macht habe usw., X, 1540 ff.; Große Auslegung des Galaterbriefs, IX, 42 ff. 645 ff.; Antwort auf das Buch des M. Ambrosius Catharinus, XVIII, 1434. 1464 ff.; Großes Bekenntnis vom heiligen Abendmahl, XX, 1101; Kurzes Bekenntnis vom heiligen Sakrament, XX, 1790 f.; Von Schleichern und Winkelpredigern, XX, 1673. 1664 ff.; Von der babylonischen Gefangenschaft der Kirche, XIX, 113 f. 117 f.; An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation, X, 314 f. 271; Daß diese Worte: Das ist mein Leib, noch fest stehen, XX, 771 ff.; Deutsche Messe und Ordnung des Gottesdienstes, X, 229; Vom Papsttum zu Rom, vom Teufel gestiftet, XVII, 1074 f.; Ordnung der Gemeinde zu Leißnig, X, 960. 969 f.; Luthers Antwort auf Heinrich VIII. usw., XIX, 341 f.; Warnung an Lorenz Castner, XX, 1759; Vom Mißbrauch der Messe, XIX, 1097 f.; Daß man die Kinder zur Schule halten solle, X, 424; Schrift von den Schlüsseln, XIX, 950 ff.; Unterricht der Visitatoren, X, 1628 ff.; — aus Predigten und Auslegungen: Ev. des zweiten Weihnachtstages, XI, 152; Joh. 7, VIII, 97 ff.; Matth. 16, 19, VII, 289; Peter-Pauls-Tag, XI, 2311 f. 2304; Prophet Joel, VI, 1628 f.; 20. n. Trin., XI, 1759; Joh. 4, 1, VII, 2129; Ps. 45, 17, V, 468; Psalmen, IV, 1136; 1 Petr. 2, 5, IX, 1173. 1013; Ex. 3, 1, III, 723; Ps. 110, 4, V, 1038 f.; Ps. 82, 4, V, 721; Ps. 45, 10, V, 423; Prov. 7, 27, V, 1517; St. Stephanstag, XI, 2065; Himmelfahrtstag, XI, 970; vgl. XI, 1911. 2304; Joh. 20, 19—31, XI, 746; Röm. 12, 8, XII, 338 f.; Gen. 27, 14, II, 278 f.; — Briefe und Meinungen: Vom Sakrament unter beiderlei Gestalt, XX, 91; Gespräche mit D. Geo. Major, XVII, 1179 f.; gegen sektiererische Geister, XX, 1684; von der Hauskommunion, X, 2224 ff.; an Melanchthon, XX, 1014; Weihe eines wahren christlichen Bischofs, XVII, 114; an Eberhard von der Tannen, XX, 1664 ff.; an die neun Männer von Herford, XXI a, 1741; an Hans Honold, XXI b, 1838.

Lord said *to* Hosea") בְּ is used, I believe that "by" is the better translation. The Lord began to speak by Hosea, made him His spokesman, who by word and deed should make known to his people the word and will of God. Hosea at the very beginning of his book calls attention to the fact that not only the command, v. 2, but all his speeches recorded in this book are not man's words, human speeches, but words of the Lord, as whose mouthpiece Hosea served.

And the Lord said unto Hosea: "Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms; for the land hath committed great whoredom, departing from the Lord." Here we are face to face with the question so puzzling to commentators, Did God actually command Hosea to marry an immoral woman? We may distinguish chiefly three classes of interpretations: First, Hosea actually married a harlot. Secondly, the prophet is recording a parable, an allegory, a vision. Thirdly, Gomer was originally a chaste woman and only later turned to immorality.

We hold that the only way to do justice to these words is to accept them as the narrative of an actual occurrence, to wit, that God actually commanded Hosea to take a woman known to be a harlot, to *marry* her, and to take, to accept as his own those children of harlotry which she would bear while married to him. Hosea was to treat Gomer as if she were his faithful wife, treat the children as if they were his own legitimate children. We shall prove our contention by showing that the objections to interpretation No. 1 are invalid and that valid objections are voiced against the other interpretations.

Various objections have been raised to interpretation No. 1. We list the three most important.

First Objection. — Such a command would have been immoral. Says A. B. Dairdam in *Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible, sub* "Hosea": "To suppose that Yahweh would have commanded His prophet to ally himself with a woman already known as of an unchaste life is absurd and monstrous." Hengstenberg, *Christologie,* III, 19, writes: *"Gott selbst kann von seinen Gesetzen nicht lossprechen. Sie sind Ausdruck seines Wesens, Abdruck seiner Heiligkeit. Willkuehr in dieser Beziehung in Gott setzen, heisst zugleich die Idee Gottes und die Idee des Guten vernichten. . . . Es ist undenkbar, dass Gott dem Propheten gleich bei Antritt seines Amts etwas geboten habe, was die segensreiche Fuehrung desselben hindern musste."*

In answer to this objection we would state that this transaction is *not* immoral. 1) Hosea is not commanded to commit adultery, but to marry a wife, love and honor her as a true, faithful husband loves and honors his spouse. 2) The adultery of the woman is neither excused nor palliated. Rather, the interpretation of the symbol shows that the woman's adultery is regarded as an abomination. See chap. 1, 2; 2, 2—5. 3) The marriage of an Israelite to a harlot was nowhere

forbidden. Only the priest was not permitted to marry a whore or a profane woman, a woman who had been ravished, or a woman put away from her husband; "for he is holy unto his God," Lev. 21, 7. Hosea was not a priest. Duhm's assertion that he was, based on the fact that he mentions priests so frequently, also the Law, 4, 6; 8, 12; unclean things, 9, 3; 5, 3; 6, 10; 9, 10; the Temple, 9, 8, is altogether unwarranted. And Hengstenberg's argument that, if it was sinful for a priest, then even more so for the prophet, carries absolutely no weight. 4) The continuation of this marriage, even after the adultery of Gomer became known to Hosea, was not immoral, since the discontinuation of such a marriage was nowhere commanded. 5) An act is immoral only if it violates a clear command of God, and only to the extent that it violates the command of God. Where there is no command of God, the question of morality cannot enter in. 6) While such a marriage would not be consummated under ordinary circumstances by a prophet, yet, since it was not immoral, there is no reason why God could not in a special instance, for a special purpose, command even this strange, though not immoral, marriage.

Second Objection. — This interpretation would not suit the symbolism. "The relation between Hosea and Gomer is said to symbolize the relation between Jahweh and Israel. But it is the view of Hosea that Israel was pure at the beginning of her union with Jahweh and only corrupted herself at a later time. In order to have consistent symbolism, Gomer must have been pure when Hosea married her and must have become corrupt later." (Eiselen, *Proph. Books,* II, 374.)

However, the marriage is nowhere said to symbolize the entire history of Israel. On the contrary, God Himself very clearly and definitely states that this marriage should symbolize the apostasy of Israel and the approaching judgment. "Marry a harlot, *for* the land is committing, זָנֹה תִּזְנֶה, great whoredom," the imperfect bringing out the enduring, present state of affairs.

Again, the names of the children, even of the first, are symbolical of the judgment about to overtake Israel, corroborating the view that only a later period in the history of Israel is to be symbolized, that of apostasy and impending judgment.

Third Objection. — Such a marriage would not have accomplished its purpose. Speaker's *Commentary on Hosea,* p. 418: "We may further observe that the supposition of Hosea's marriage being an example of acted prophecy (*sermo propheticus realis*) is clogged by the difficulty that symbolical action, to be impressive, would require to be transacted in a brief space of time, so as to present a complete picture at one view, accompanied by its word of exposition. The designed effect would be lost in a transaction going on through a series of years and offering no entire scene to the spectator. Not till the

whole facts were at the last gathered together with the exposition annexed (as in this prophesying), could the lesson taught by them have been apprehended. The *sermo realis* as observed during its actions would have been in itself ineffective; it was the entire narrative alone that could give the lesson. And as the narration would do this just as graphically and effectively if the story was an imaginary one as if the events had been real, the supposition of their reality is as superfluous as it is embarrassing."

In answer we say that, if we can prove our interpretation to be the only correct one, we can safely leave the question of the adequacy of this transaction to God. If He chose this manner of dealing with His people, it certainly was an adequate and effective way. Whether it actually accomplished its purpose is a different matter.

Having shown that the objections to interpretation No. 1 are invalid, let us examine the parabolic, allegorical, and visionary interpretation. This is the interpretation adopted by the Chaldean Targum: "Go and take a wife, *i. e.*, go prophesy against the inhabitants of the idolatrous state." Luther, followed by a number of Lutheran theologians: "The prophet has given to his own chaste wife only the name and deeds of an adulteress, therefore has enacted a sort of play." This is also the opinion of Calvin: "The Lord has placed me here as on a stage that I should tell you I have taken a wife," etc. Hengstenberg rejects the parabolic interpretation, but claims that all this happened in a vision. The whole transaction was merely an inner experience of the prophet. He insists that all names are allegorical. A marriage actually never took place. The reasons which speak against this interpretation follow.

1) There is not the slightest hint of the parabolic character of this transaction. In rejecting the parabolic interpretation, Hengstenberg clearly states that it did eliminate the possibility of distinguishing between parable and history.

2) The moral difficulty is not removed. "If the transaction itself would have been repugnant to the moral sense, is it possible that the prophet would have chosen it as the basis of an allegory?" (Eiselen, *Proph. Books,* Vol. 2, u. 375.) Just as little does Hengstenberg's visionary theory remove the moral difficulty felt by him.

3) While the names of the children are clearly allegorical, since the Lord Himself interprets them so and the names are easily recognized as allegorical, the name of the wife, Gomer, and her mother, Diblaim, defy all efforts at allegorizing. Both names occur only here. Etymologically, Gomer has been explained as a derivation from the root גָּמַר, to complete, finish; cp. Ps. 57, 8; 138, 8; or to be finished, to cease, Ps. 7, 10; 12, 2, etc. Hence Jerome translates "the perfect one"; Raschi, "that fulfilled all evil"; Kimchi, "fulfilment of punishment"; Calvin, "consumption"; Speaker: "Gomer, consummation

(the perfection of a vicious character and the coming to an end in ruin), the wife of Salvation (Hosea), appears a suitable combination to represent Israel as the wife of Jehovah. — בַּת־דִּבְלָיִם has been translated by Hengstenberg "daughter of fig cakes" (which were usually baked in double layers)=*filia deliciarum*=*deliciis dedita,* a daughter of, or given to, delicacies, sensuousness. The dual of Debelah, however, never occurs. The closest approach is Diblathaim, the name of a city, Num. 33, 46 and Jer. 48, 22, which has been regarded by some as the home city of Gomer. Scripture nowhere mentions such layer cakes assumed by Hengstenberg. Others translate "a sweet woman" or "a daughter of idolatry," since fig and raisin cakes were used in idolatrous sacrifices; others derive Diblaim from a word "press" and refer the name to the plumpness of the body. We note that each succeeding interpretation is only a little more far-fetched than its predecessors. Very evidently these two words defy every attempt at allegorizing.

The allegorical interpretation therefore cannot satisfy us. In fact, it has been abandoned quite generally in our day.

There remains the third interpretation: Gomer was at the time of her marriage to Hosea a chaste woman, though inclined to immorality, and only later played the harlot. This interpretation with minor differences in detail is practically universally adopted in our day by all leading commentaries. One example may suffice. We read in the *Expositor's Bible,* Vol. IV, p. 501: "Robertson Smith in *Prophets of Israel* says: 'The struggle of Hosea's shame and grief when he found his wife unfaithful is altogether inconceivable unless his first love had been pure and full of truth in the purity of its object.' How, then, are we to reconcile with this the statement of that command to take a wife of the character so frankly described? In this way — and we owe the interpretation to the same lamented scholar —: When, some years after his marriage, Hosea at last began to be aware of the character of her whom he had taken to his home, and while he still brooded upon it, God revealed to him why He who knoweth all things from the beginning had suffered His servant to marry such a woman; and Hosea, by a very natural anticipation, in which he is imitated by other prophets,[1]) pushed back his own knowl-

1) "Two instances are usually quoted. The one is Is. 6, where most are agreed that what Isaiah has stated there at his inaugural vision is not only what happened in the earliest moments of his prophetic life, but this spelled out and emphasized by his experience since. The other instance is Jer. 32, 8, where the prophet tells us that he became convinced that the Lord spoke to him on a certain occasion only after a subsequent event proved this to be the case." Yet a closer study of both passages will soon convince the reader that neither passage proves the contention of Smith and the writer of the footnote in *Expositor's.*

edge of God's purpose to the date when that purpose began actually to be fulfilled, the day of his betrothal. This, though he was all unconscious of its fatal future, had been to Hosea the beginning of the word of the Lord. On that uncertain voyage he had sailed with sealed orders."

The claims made for this interpretation are: —

1) This interpretation does away with the immoral character of Hosea's marriage. — Yet we have seen that there was no immorality involved in Hosea's marriage; hence there is no immorality to be done away with.

2) This interpretation alone is in keeping with the symbolism of the marriage. — We have seen that the symbolism of this marriage according to God's own interpretation is not intended to cover the entire national life of Israel, but only the period of apostasy and idolatry.

3) This interpretation alone does justice to the text. — If the prophet had married a harlot, he would have called her so, Zonah. The expression employed אֵשֶׁת זְנוּנִים, does not mean a harlot, but a woman that has a propensity to become a harlot (*"die veranlagt ist, eine Hure zu werden"*; Sellin). The contention is that the Hebrew idiom, man of bloods, (אִישׁ דָּמִים), woman of contentiousnesses (אֵשֶׁת מְדָנִים), of virtues, of whoredoms, etc., does not describe a person actually engaged in the respective virtue or wickedness, but one merely disposed or inclined toward them; as Sellin puts it: The term refers not to a profession, but to an attribute; *"bezeichnet nicht einen Beruf, sondern eine Eigenschaft."* We shall show that this interpretation does not do justice to this peculiar Hebrew idiom. Take Ruth 3, 11 and Prov. 12, 4, the virtuous woman. The woman of virtue, אֵשֶׁת חַיִל, is evidently not merely one who is inclined to virtue, but one who shows her virtue by her actions; else, how could Ruth be known as a virtuous woman and the woman of virtue, Prov. 12, 4, be a crown to her husband? Prov. 21, 9 we read: "It is better to dwell in a corner of the house top than with a brawling woman," a woman of contentions, אֵשֶׁת מְדָנִים, "in a wide house." Cp. also Prov. 27, 15. A woman that is merely inclined to quarrelings without showing her inclination, surely would not have drawn out this scathing rebuke. These examples prove that the Hebrew idiom does not merely denote a person having a certain inclination, or tendency, but one who actually follows this inclination and by his action shows his ruling spirit. A woman of whoredoms is therefore not merely a woman inclined to immorality, who spite of this inclination is still chaste, but a woman wholly given to unchastity and immorality in spirit and in deed. Such a woman the prophet is to marry. Again, he is to take, accept, children of whoredoms; as his wife was a harlot, so his children were to be children born in whoredom, not his own,

legitimate offspring. He remained pure and chaste, but the children which Gomer was to bear to him were in fact illegitimate children. Yet he was to accept both the wife of whoredoms as his own, and the children she bore him (cf. v. 3) he was to accept, acknowledge, as his own, since they were born by the woman who was his wife, even though they were the issue of her unchastity.

We see that interpretation No. 3 does not do justice to, but militates against, the clear words of the text.

Sellin goes so far as to assert that Gomer was at her marriage not a harlot and her three children were legitimate offspring of Hosea. Only after the birth of the third child did she play the harlot, and according to Sellin "the verse following 1, 9, which told of her fall, has dropped out, and in its place was put the present verse, which does not at all fit into the context. The verse read about as follows: "And she weaned Lo-ammi and went up to Bethel [?] and committed adultery there (4, 14. 15 f.), and this was told Hosea, and he put her out of his house (9, 15) and said (2, 2): "She is not my wife, neither am I her husband." That certainly is not exegesis, interpretation, but merely reading into the text, rather adding to the text, interpolating, what the text simply does not state or intimate. We hold therefore that God actually commanded Hosea to marry an unchaste woman and to accept those children born by her to him in this state of wedlock as his own children.

It is a strange command which the Lord gave to Hosea at the very beginning of his office, a command involving a fearful sacrifice on the part of the prophet. "The Lord said to Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms; for the land hath committed great whoredom, departing from the Lord." The covenant relation between God and Israel is frequently compared to that of a husband to his wife (already implied in Ex. 34, 15 f., go a-whoring after their gods, Lev. 17, 7; Num. 15, 39, etc., and directly called so in the Song of Solomon; Is. 50, 1; 54, 1. 5. 6; 62, 4. 5; Jer. 2, 2; 3, 1 ff. 14. 20; Ex. 16, 8 ff.; etc.) or that of a father and his children (Ex. 4, 22; Deut. 32, 5. 6. 19; Is. 63, 16; 64, 7; Jer. 3, 4. 14. 22; Ps. 73, 15; Mal. 1, 6; 2, 10, etc.). The whole nation, regarded as a unit, is the wife, the mother, while the individual members constituting the nation are the children of God, the Husband of Israel and the Father of the Israelites and of Israel, the legal wife of God and mother of the Israelites. This relation was to be one of mutual love and esteem. God had promised His grace and every blessing to His people, Ex. 19, 5. 6; 20, 6; the nation, the wife, had vowed allegiance, loyalty, willing obedience, Ex. 19, 8; 20, 19. On this basis the covenant was established, Ex. 24, 3—11. However, Israel had become a harlot, disloyal to her Husband and Lord, idolatrous, Hos. 1, 1b. By a strange symbolical act Hosea was to show to Israel the

utter heinousness of its offense. Note the כִּי; *for* the land hath committed whoredoms. The shameful whoredom of Israel motivated the strange marriage of Hosea to a harlot. A wife of whoredoms is a wife given over utterly to immorality. Neither was Gomer, the daughter of Diblaim, to cease her harlotry after her marriage to the chaste prophet; for the children she bore to the prophet, v. 3, while she was married to him, who were regarded as his children, were in fact children of whoredoms, conceived in adulterous unions with her paramours, born as illegitimate children. Still Hosea was not permitted to divorce her; he was told to keep her and take, accept, regard, and treat her children as though they were his own. What a strange, difficult request! To sacrifice every prospect of a happy marriage, to endure the daily agony of observing the adulteries of his wife, to be obliged to keep this harlot as his spouse, to expose himself to the suspicion as though he were as wicked as she, — how unnatural it seems to us, and oh, how difficult! This woman bore unto *him* a son, presented him with a son, the issue of her adultery, a son of whoredom, and actually expected him to acknowledge that bastard child as his own legitimate offspring. Surely that was the height of brazen impudence, intolerable affrontery. Yet Hosea, in obedience to God's command, went and took Gomer, the daughter of Diblaim, v. 3. Truly a remarkable example of absolute obedience and submission to the will of God. "Only to do Thy will my will shall be." And truly a remarkable patience with, and tolerance of, outrageous impertinence and shamelessness. — Yet, was not the demand of Israel upon her Husband even more outrageous? Though she was God's wife, though she had vowed allegiance to Him, though He had showered upon her untold blessings, yet she committed great whoredom, departing from the Lord, v. 2. The mother, Israel as a nation, played the harlot, chap. 2, 5; the individuals were children of whoredoms, of like nature as their mother, like her steeped in idolatry and Baal worship. Still Israel demanded recognition as the spouse, as the children of Jehovah, requesting as their covenant right protection and blessing of Him whose covenant they had broken long ago. What an impudence, worthy of their shameless adultery, to grieve Him with their sins, to cut Him to the quick with their wicked adulteries, to lay Him open to the suspicion as though He countenanced their idolatry, cp. Ps. 50, 21; Rom. 2, 24, and then calmly and with brazen impertinence to demand His help and aid because He was their covenant God, Israel's Husband. Shall God permit this unnatural condition to continue? No! The very names of the children of Gomer are symbolical of the fate which shall soon overtake Israel in penalty of her adulterous idolatry. Each one of the children of Gomer represents Israel in its entirety, only different phases of the judgment being emphasized by each one. Jezreel shall be the

name of the first-born. Why? Since the Lord Himself gives the answer, it is futile to look for other reasons.[2])

Vv. 4. 5: "For yet a little while, and I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu and will cause to cease the kingdom of the house of Israel; and it shall come to pass at that day that I will break the bow of Israel in the Valley of Jezreel." The expression "blood of Jezreel" cannot refer to the extermination of the house of Ahab by Jehu, for that was commanded and commended by God, 2 Kings 9, 1—10; 10, 30. This term rather signifies the blood of Naboth shed at Jezreel by Ahab and Jezebel. This bloody atrocity stands out with special prominence in the long annals of crimes recorded against Israel and its royalty. "The blood of Jezreel," this expression at once recalled to every Israelite that cold-blooded shedding of Naboth's blood, in which crime the atrocious wickedness of the bloodthirsty pair occupying Israel's throne culminated. "The blood of Jezreel," these words conjure up to our minds that truly awful curse pronounced upon Ahab and Jezebel because of their bloody murder, 1 Kings 21, 20—24, literally fulfilled at the death of Ahab, 1 Kings 22, 35. 38, and in the extermination of Jezebel and the house of Ahab, in which Jezreel played so conspicuous a part, 2 Kings 9. 10. This divine judgment on the house of Ahab had been executed by Jehu and witnessed by the entire nation. Yet neither executor nor witness had profited by the example of divine justice. Instead of guarding against Ahab's wickedness, from the blood of Jezreel, from murder and bloodshed and similar crimes, such atrocities were quite common, bloods touching bloods in Israel, Hos. 4, 2; 6, 8 ff.; Amos 2, 6 ff.; 4, 1. Therefore, in accordance with the immovable justice of God the sins of the fathers were now to be visited upon the children, the wickedness of the predecessors on the throne on their successors. The ruling house as well as the entire nation was to feel the wrath of God. The house of Jehu shall be deposed (cf. 2 Kings 10, 30—33), and Israel shall no longer be a nation. Israel shall be Jezreel. Note the alliteration, the sharp sibilants cutting the hearer to the very marrow, Israel-Jezreel, reeking with blood, which cries to God for vengeance like the blood of Abel. Their sins equaled those of Ahab; their punishment shall be the same. Both the royal house and the nation shall be exterminated. And as in the judgment upon Ahab for the blood of Naboth the city of Jezreel played so prominent

2) According to a number of commentators the etymology of the word *Jezreel* determined its choice. They translate, "God scatters." While we concede that in chap. 2, 22. 23 the etymology of Jezreel is undoubtedly referred to, yet etymology does not come into consideration here. 1) Etymology, clearly indicated, 2, 23, is not hinted at here. 2) Jezreel means "God sows," cf. 2, 23; the translation "God scatters," which would be required here, cannot be established.

a part, so the bow of Israel shall be broken, Israel shorn of its power, in the Valley of Jezreel. While the exact location of the decisive battle is not named in the Bible, it undoubtedly took place in this valley, the scene of so many battles in ancient and modern times. Deborah, Gideon, Saul, Ahab, Josiah, Nebuchadnezzar, Vespasian, Justinian, Saladin, Napoleon, all fought here, the extensive plain offering an especially suitable battle-ground.

This judgment upon Israel shall not be merely a temporal one, like the seventy years of captivity of Judah. The name of the daughter which later was born to the prophet, *Lo Ruhamah* ("she is not pitied"), symbolized that there would be no more mercy for Israel, no return of the people as such to the land of their fathers. Nor is the material glory only to be taken from Israel; also their spiritual prerogatives shall be lost to them. That also was already implied in Lo Ruhamah and is once more and expressly symbolized by the name of the third child of Gomer, Lo-ammi, "not My people." That terrible judgment which came upon Judah only in the time of the apostle, 1 Thess. 2, 16, now already came upon the Northern Kingdom. Ye are not My people, and I am not yours! Rejected by God, disowned by Jehovah, repudiated, rejected, forever! Verily, Israel shall be Jezreel!

Shall, then, the name of Israel perish from the earth? Did the unchanging Lord change His counsel? Did He forget, did He deliberately set at naught His promise given to the patriarchs, Gen. 12, 3; 15, 5; 22, 18; 26, 4; 28, 14? No, that promise, like all the promises of God, was still in Him yea and in Him Amen. Though Israel was faithless, unfaithful, the Lord God of the Amen abideth faithful, He cannot deny Himself, 2 Tim. 2, 13. Though Israel is Jezreel, though the kingdom has been taken away, God's mercy withdrawn, the nation forever rejected, "yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured or numbered," v. 10. Here the Lord combines all the prophecies given to the patriarchs, taking various expressions from the various prophecies and combining them into one promise, in which all shall be fulfilled. There shall be countless children of Israel. How is that possible? "It shall come to pass that in the place where it was said unto them, 'Ye are not My people,' there it shall be said unto them, 'Ye are the sons of the living God.'" God lives, and not one of His promises shall perish. Because the living God has promised unto Abraham children as numberless as the sands on the shore of the sea, He, the God of Life, can, Luke 3, 8, and He, the Lord of Truth, will awaken children unto Abraham and Israel. Such as had not been His people, as had been spiritually dead in trespasses and sins, children of wrath by nature, shall by His almighty grace be made children of the living God who like their Father are possessed of life, spiritual

life, life eternal. Where shall these sons of God, the true children of Israel, be found? In the same place where it was said of them, "Ye are not My people." The innumerable children of Israel shall be composed of such as had once upon a time been called Lo-ammi. That, of course, includes apostate Israel, to whom this very term had been applied, vv. 8. 9. Yet they are not the only ones to whom this term applies. Even before Israel was so called, there were masses of such as were not a people, the countless thousands of heathen of all nations and tongues and peoples, steeped in sin and vice, Eph. 2, 1 ff.; Rom. 1, 18 ff. Israel had become like unto them, had sunk from her high position to the lowest depths of idolatrous pagandom. Out of this *massa perdita* of heathen with whom Israel according to the flesh had become amalgamated, the Lord will raise children unto Abraham, a true Israel according to the Spirit, Rom. 2, 28. 29; 9, 6—8; Gal. 4, 28. Because of the admission and reception of these heathen into spiritual Israel, into the New Testament Church, God's promise given to Abraham shall indeed be fulfilled. Very clearly God here prophesies the admission of the heathen into the covenant relations with God. So Peter, 1 Pet. 2, 10, and Paul, Rom. 9, 25. 26, interpret this prophecy.

"Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together." Then shall there be no more two kingdoms. That breach which for centuries had severed Judah and Israel shall have been healed. The true children of God out of Judah and Israel according to the flesh shall be gathered together and, with all the children of God among the Gentiles, shall form one people, Eph. 4, 4—6; *una sancta catholica ecclesia.* And there shall be but one Lord. They shall "appoint themselves one head." Though the temporal kingdom was lost, alas! forever, v. 4, yet a kingdom, a spiritual kingdom, would be restored to Israel. Cp. Acts 1, 6. The King of the New Testament Israel is actually an Israelite according to the flesh, of the seed of Abraham, the house of David, Jesus of Nazareth. Under the leadership of this *only* Head "they shall come up out of the land." From wherever they have been called into the sonship of God, they shall come up into that spiritual kingdom of Christ, which knows no boundaries, no limits, which extends to the end of the world. Being in the world, yet not of it, John 17, 11. 14, their conversation is in heaven, Phil. 3, 20. No longer do they run with their former companions to the same excess of riot, 1 Pet. 4, 4, but walk on the highway of holiness, on which the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads, Is. 35, 8—10. And then, surely, "great shall be the day of Jezreel." The name of apostate Israel is here used of spiritual Israel in so far as it partook of the penalties inflicted upon Israel as a nation. Spiritual Israel, as part and parcel of the Northern Kingdom, was deeply

affected and grieved by the loss of kingdom and power. It seemed to them indeed as though God had altogether rejected even spiritual Israel. Yet to the true Israel the same blessed fact applies that the Lord through Isaiah revealed about the same time to comfort Judah in her coming hour of sore distress, Is. 49, 14—16; 54, 4—10. Like spiritual Judah, spiritual Israel, though feeling keenly the judgments of God visited upon their respective nations, was not rejected; in due time would come the great day of Jezreel. And in anticipation of that glorious day the Lord turns to His faithful children: "Say ye unto your brethren, Ammi ["My people"], and to your sisters, Ruhamah ["beloved, one who has obtained mercy"]." In true brotherliness shall all the members of God's people acknowledge one another as children of the one Father, all having experienced the same compassion. Read Rom. 15, 7—13, which exactly describes the situation here pictured. Note that the three names Jezreel, Lo-ammi, Lo-ruhamah, mentioned as phases of the judgment of God, are here referred to in a manner which shows that every trace of wrath and punishment is gone.

Hengstenberg, like most modern commentators, will not concede that this is a direct prophecy of the conversion of the pagan world. He admits that Paul, Rom. 9, 25. 26, does not merely allude to Hos. 2, 10 ff., but directly quotes this passage as proving the calling of the Gentiles. But then he proceeds: "How can a declaration which according to the entire context can refer only to Israel be directly referred to the Gentiles? The answer is found as soon as we trace the prophecy back to its idea. This is nothing else than that of divine mercy, the execution of which may be hindered by apostasy and disloyalty, but which can never be extinguished, since it is based on the essence of God; cf. Jer. 31, 20. As this idea was realized in the reacceptance of the children of Israel as children of God, so it is realized in the acceptance of the Gentiles. *Because* God has promised to accept the children of Israel again, He must accept also the heathen. We are here speaking not of a mere application, but of a real proof. *Because* God has promised to reaccept the children of Israel, He must accept also the Gentiles. Else that divine counsel would rest on arbitrariness, which is inconceivable in God. Even if the Gentiles are not so near as Israel, still He must, just because He acknowledges the nearer claims, also satisfy the farther ones." That is rationalism pure and simple. God must because — we can see no other way. Must God accept Gentiles because He has promised to accept apostate Israel? Is such a conclusion at all logical? Must I give apples to twenty Negroes because I have promised to give an apple to one white child? Moreover, is Hengstenberg's interpretation doing justice to Paul's use of these words? Is not the selfsame Spirit speaking through Paul that spoke through Hosea? And is not this Spirit the best interpreter of His words? Since the Spirit speaking through

Paul says so, we believe that the Spirit speaking through Hosea here prophesied the calling of the Gentiles. Kimchi says: "This shall take place in the gathering together of the exiles in the day of the Messiah; for unto the second house there went up only Judah and Benjamin, who had been exiles in Babylon; nor were the children of Judah and the children of Israel gathered together; and they shall make for themselves one head — this is the King Messiah." (*The Pulpit Commentary*, p. 9. See also Stoeckhardt, *Roemerbrief, ad* Rom. 9, 25. 26.) *(To be continued.)* THEO. LAETSCH.

Dispositionen über die zweite von der Synodalkonferenz angenommene Evangelienreihe.

Neujahr.

Luk. 12, 4—9.

Im neuen Jahr will uns JEsus neu begnaden, Klagel. 3, 22. 23; Jes. 54, 10. Im neuen Jahr wollen wir ihm mit neuer Liebe anhangen.

Als Freunde JEsu wollen wir ihn auch im neuen Jahr freudig bekennen.

1. Als Freunde JEsu wollen wir uns nicht vor Menschen, sondern vor Gott fürchten.
2. Als Freunde JEsu wollen wir uns des trösten, daß Gott uns nicht vergißt.
3. Als Freunde JEsu wird er uns auch bekennen vor den Engeln Gottes.

1.

V. 4. Freunde JEsu, welch eine Ehre! Freunde JEsu, des Sohnes Gottes, des Heilandes der Welt. Freunde JEsu; vgl. Joh. 15, 10—15, wo JEsus die Liebe und Vertrautheit schildert, mit der er mit seinen Freunden verkehrt. Als solche Freunde sollen und wollen wir JEsum bekennen, seine Person und sein Werk in Wort und Tat rühmen und preisen. (Ausführen.) Menschenfurcht will uns oft die Zunge binden und den Mut zum Tatbekenntnis nehmen. Da heißt es V. 4 bedenken und sich nicht fürchten vor Menschen. Von Gott hingegen gilt V. 5; und das wird er tun, wenn wir JEsum nicht bekennen und also zeigen, daß unsere Freundschaft zu JEsu nur eine erheuchelte ist. Ohne Menschenfurcht, aber in rechter Gottesfurcht wollen wir JEsum bekennen.

2.

Aber es ist doch nichts Geringes, die Gunst der Menschen zu verlieren. Das mag in sich schließen Verlust von Amt, Arbeit und Brot, Verlust des erhofften politischen Postens, vielleicht lebenslängliche Armut und Verachtung. Fürchtet euch nicht! Ihr seid Freunde JEsu, und

wenn auch Menschen sich von euch abwenden und sich euch widersetzen, JEsus steht euch zur Seite. Und durch ihn ist ja Gott euer versöhnter Vater geworden. Der allmächtige Gott, der alles erhält und regiert, liebt euch. „Der Wolken, Luft und Winden" usw., hat euch in sein Herz geschlossen. Der die Sperlinge, von denen man zwei für einen Pfennig kaufen kann — ja wenn man zwei Pfennige ausgibt, bekommt man noch einen umsonst —, nicht vergißt, der hat alle eure Haare gezählt, V. 6. 7, und wird ihrer nicht vergessen. So liebevoll und fürsorglich nimmt Gott sich euer an. Fürchtet euch nicht, wenn die Menschen um eures Bekenntnisses willen euch hassen! JEsus, Gott, ist bei euch. Darum bekennt freudig.

3.

V. 8. 9. Verleugnen wir, dann mögen wir von Menschen noch als Christen angesehen werden. Aber Christus verleugnet uns dann vor seinen Engeln. Er wird seine Engel nicht mehr ausschicken zu unserm Dienst, und die Engel werden sich von uns zurückziehen. Am Ende der Welt werden die Engel uns als Unkraut sammeln, Matth. 13, 41, uns vor den Richter bringen, auf sein Geheiß uns zu seiner Linken stellen, Matth. 25, 31, und dann wird JEsus öffentlich von uns bekennen: Matth. 25, 41—45. Soll das unser Los sein? Davor bewahre uns Gott in Gnaden! Vielmehr wollen wir JEsum bekennen, dann wird er auch seine Verheißung in V. 8 wahr machen. Mag uns die Welt schimpfen und verachten, mag unser Christentum und unsere Liebe in Zweifel gezogen werden, mögen wir Freunde verlieren um unsers Bekenntnisses willen, Christus wird uns bekennen vor seinen Engeln. Er wird erfüllen Ps. 91, 11. 12; er wird mit uns handeln nach Luk. 16, 22. Am Jüngsten Tage werden die heiligen Engel uns als Weizen in seine Scheuern sammeln, Matth. 13, 30, und Christus wird vor ihnen von uns bekennen: Matth. 25, 34—40.

Bleiben wir Freunde JEsu im neuen Jahr! Verharren wir in rechter Gottesfurcht im Wort- und Tatbekenntnis unsers Heilandes! Dann werden wir den Schutz unsers Gottes genießen, dann werden wir hier und dort von JEsu als seine Freunde anerkannt worden. T. L.

Sonntag nach Neujahr.

Luk. 13, 18—24.

Vorgestern sind wir ins neue Jahr eingetreten. Wir wollen darin nicht nur Gottes Gnadengaben entgegennehmen, sondern auch seinem Worte gemäß die Reichsarbeit verrichten, vor allem in unserer eigenen Gemeinde. Wir betrachten also:

Drei Punkte, die wir bei unserer Gemeindearbeit stets im Auge behalten müssen:

1. das äußere Wachstum der Gemeinde;
2. ihr inneres Wachstum;
3. unser eigenes Seelenheil.

1.

a. Die Kirche Christi soll auch äußerlich wachsen, V. 19. Das kleine Senfkorn soll ein großer Baum werden, Matth. 28, 18—20; Luk. 14, 23. Viele arme Sünder sollen in der Kirche Ruhe und Rettung finden. Die Kirche muß also Mission treiben.

b. Das verlangt Gott auch von unserer Gemeinde, denn wenn die einzelnen Gemeinden nicht größer werden, kann das sichtbare Reich Gottes auf Erden nicht wachsen. Wie steht es nun in unserer Gemeinde? Haben wir in der Vergangenheit unsere Pflicht getan? Wir wollen uns heute aufraffen und dem HErrn geloben, daß wir in diesem Jahre sein Reich eifriger bauen wollen. Das soll jeder einzelne tun, Jes. 53, 2. 3.

c. Kirche und Gemeinde können aber nur durch das Evangelium gebaut werden. Das ist das Senfkorn, mit göttlicher Kraft ausgerüstet. Keine andern Mittel gebrauchen!

2.

a. Die Kirche soll aber auch innerlich wachsen und zunehmen, V. 21. „Gottes Wort wirkt und wächst auch nach innen. Es hat die Kraft, Herz und Wandel der Menschen zu erneuern und zu heiligen. Das Wort wandelt Dichten und Denken, Leben und Wandel des Menschen in seine Art um.“ (Stöckhardt.) Das ist die Hauptsache, Eph. 2, 20—22.

b. Das darf eine christliche Gemeinde nicht vergessen. Sie darf nicht mit äußerem Wachstum, großen Zahlen, schönen Gebäuden und Menschenruhm zufrieden sein. Das innere, geistliche Leben muß gepflegt werden. Seelsorge, brüderliche Ermahnung, Kirchenzucht. Wie oft wird dies versäumt!

c. Auch dies innerliche Wachstum kann nur durch das Evangelium zustande kommen. Dies ist der rechte Sauerteig. 1 Petr. 2, 2.

3.

a. Bei alledem dürfen wir aber unser eigenes Seelenheil nicht vernachlässigen. Wie oft geschieht das gerade von denen, die emsig an andern Mission und Seelsorge treiben oder sich sonst in der sichtbaren Kirche viel zu schaffen machen!

b. Jesu Mahnruf gilt daher jedem Arbeiter im Reiche Gottes: V. 24a. Das ist eine ernste Sache; denn viele, die es für selbstverständlich halten, daß sie durch die enge Pforte eingehen werden, „werden's nicht tun können“, V. 24b. Darum „ringet“! Gottes Wort mit Gebet das einzige Mittel.

Schluß. Zusammenfassung. Aufforderung, für bisherige Faulheit und Nachlässigkeit Buße zu tun und im neuen Jahre nach dem, was wir heute aus Gottes Wort gelernt haben, zu handeln. E. J. F.

Epiphanias.

Matth. 4, 12—17.

Epiphanias! Der Heiden Weihnacht! Das erinnert uns an unsere Missionspflicht.

Woher kommt es, daß wir nicht fleißiger Mission treiben?

1. Weil wir nicht recht erkennen die Finsternis, die über die Heiden herrscht;
2. weil wir nicht immer bedenken, daß allein JEsus ihnen helfen kann;
3. weil wir so leicht vergessen, daß JEsus allein durchs Wort zu den Heiden kommt.

1.

V. 16. Finsternis, das heißt, Unglaube, Sünde und Schande. Man schildere hier das Sündenelend und den ganzen Jammer des hoffnungslosen Heidentums. Sie wohnen am Ort des Todes, wo der Tod wohnt und herrscht, dem sie nicht entrinnen können. Sie sitzen im Schatten des Todes, der seine düsteren Schatten über ihr ganzes Leben wirft, so daß sie durch Furcht des Todes im ganzen Leben Knechte sein müssen, Hebr. 2, 14. Todesfurcht beherrscht sie, treibt sie oft zur Verzweiflung und zum Selbstmord, um, wie sie törichterweise meinen, dem Elend zu entrinnen.

V. 15. Hier hat der Prophet nicht Gegenden im Sinn, die weit entfernt liegen; Zabulon usw. waren Teile des Gelobten Landes, wo Gottes Wort gepredigt wurde. Und doch herrschte Finsternis in diesem Lande. In unserm Lande, in den christlichen Ländern unserer Zeit, wieviel Finsternis herrscht, trotzdem das Evangelium gepredigt wird! Aberglaube, Wahrsagerei, Spiritismus, unglückliche Heiraten, Gewissensangst usw. Und wir? Wir sitzen im Licht und haben vergessen, was für ein erschrecklich Ding geistliche Finsternis ist. Unsere Rechnung für Licht, Öl, Gas, Elektrizität, um irdische Finsternis zu vertreiben, beläuft sich oft auf mehr als unsere Beiträge das ganze Jahr hindurch, um geistliche Finsternis aus der Welt zu schaffen. Lassen wir uns doch das Elend und den Jammer der Heidenwelt recht zu Herzen gehen! Dann werden wir auch viel mehr Anteil am Werk der Mission nehmen.

2.

JEsus hilft. Mit ihm kommt Licht in die Finsternis, V. 16. Denn mit ihm kommt das Reich Gottes, V. 17, hier zeitlich und dort ewiglich. Man male den Christen lebendig vor Augen, wie sie in Christo Licht haben in der Nacht der Trübsal, in der Finsternis der Sündennot, in Krankheit, in Armut, im Leben und im Sterben; welch herrliche Vorrechte sie genießen als Bürger des Himmelreichs, Eph. 2, 19—22; 1 Petr. 2, 9. Ja, JEsus vertreibt Finsternis und bringt das Licht des Himmels.

Aber JEsus allein tut das. Ohne JEsum kein Heil und keine Seligkeit. JEsus sagt: Tut Buße, ändert euren Sinn! Darin liegt, daß, wer das nicht tut, wer JEsum nicht als seinen Heiland annimmt, ewig hoffnungslos verloren ist. Nicht äußere Kultur, nicht Zivilisation und Bildung, ist es, was den Heiden wirklich helfen und sie zu dem wahren Glück bringen kann, sondern JEsus, und zwar JEsus allein. Vergessen wir das nicht!

3.

Aber dieser JEsus kommt zu uns in seinem Wort, V. 17. JEsus selber fing an zu predigen und zu zeugen, und so predigte er sein Leben lang sich selbst als den Sohn Gottes und der Welt Heiland. Als er dann die Erde verließ, sollte diese Predigt nicht verstummen, sondern: Matth. 28, 19. 20. Das ist das einzige Mittel, wodurch Menschen zum Glauben kommen, Röm. 10, 14. 15. Durch das Wort allein sind wir zum Glauben gekommen. Und wollen wir das Heil, das wir genießen, andern bringen, so müssen wir ihnen das Wort, das uns zu Christen gemacht hat und im Glauben erhält, andern predigen. Ohne die Willigkeit, das Evangelium zu predigen, nützen alle andern Anstrengungen, die Heiden aus ihrem Elend zu erretten, nichts. Das wollen wir nicht vergessen und aus Dankbarkeit dafür, daß uns Gott errettet hat aus der schauerlichen Finsternis des Todes und uns versetzt in das Reich seines Sohnes, in das Reich des Lichts und des Lebens, nun das helle Licht des Evangeliums hinausbringen, damit dadurch vielen der Weg zum Himmel gezeigt werde. T. L.

Erster Sonntag nach Epiphanias.

Matth. 10, 32—39.

Das Kreuz spielt eine wichtige Rolle im Leben des Christen. JEsus selbst sagt: Matth. 16, 24; vgl. Hebr. 12, 8. Luther: „Ein Christ ist eben in dem, daß er ein Christ heißt, unter das liebe Kreuz geworfen, daß er muß leiden entweder von Leuten oder vom Teufel selbst. . . . Das heißt und ist der Christen Losung und Malzeichen.“ (XII, 544.)

Das ist immer noch wahr. Aufrichtige Christen sind Kreuzträger, der eine mehr, der andere weniger. Wir wissen das aus Erfahrung. Deshalb betrachten wir zu unserer Belehrung und Ermunterung:

Das heilige Kreuz im Leben der Kinder Gottes.

1. Wie wahre Kinder Gottes das heilige Kreuz auf sich nehmen;
2. warum sie es geduldig tragen.

1.

a. Worin besteht das Kreuz? Als Kinder Gottes dürfen wir ja alle unsere Leiden, körperliche und irdische sowohl als geistliche, unter das Kreuz rechnen; aber streng genommen, gehören nur die

Trübsale, die um JEsu willen auf uns kommen, zu dem Kreuz, das wir ihm nachtragen. V. 39: „um meinetwillen". Luther: „Das andere Kreuz, als, wenn einer Krankheit, Wehetage, Elend und Jammer leidet am Leibe oder an der Nahrung, . . . das heißt eigentlich nicht ein Kreuz, sondern ein Leiden." (XI, 2242.) Das Leiden um JEsu willen ist eben die Hoffarbe, die uns von den Ungläubigen unterscheidet. — Frage: Ist es nicht auffallend, wie wenig die meisten unter uns um JEsu willen leiden?

b. Wie nimmt man das Kreuz auf sich? Es gibt nur eine Weise: Christum bekennen. Vgl. V. 32 mit V. 34. 38. Solange man seinen Glauben unter dem Scheffel verbirgt, sind Teufel und Welt zufrieden; bekennt man aber seinen Heiland durch Wort und Wandel, dann werden Hohn, Haß und Verfolgung nicht lange ausbleiben. Das beweist die Kirchengeschichte. Beispiel: Stephanus, Apost. 7; die großen Christenverfolgungen; Luther. Das freimütige Bekenntnis von Christo richtet immer Zorn und Verfolgung an, V. 34. Die Bekenner und die Kreuzträger sind immer dieselben Leute; denn durch das offene Bekenntnis von Christo nimmt man sein Kreuz auf sich. — Frage: Würden wir wohl in unsern Tagen so wenig um JEsu willen zu leiden brauchen, wenn wir kühner und entschiedener in unserm Bekenntnis wären, auch im täglichen Leben?

2.

a. Das Christenkreuz ist allerdings eine schwere Last. Das betont JEsus in unserm Text. Bekenntnistreue Kreuzträger werden gehaßt und verfolgt werden, V. 34; vgl. V. 22a. 17f. 23a; häufig werden ihre Familien durch Glaubensuneinigkeit zersprengt und ihre Liebsten in bittere Feinde verwandelt werden, V. 35f.; vgl. V. 21; ja; sie werden vielleicht sogar den Märtyrertod erleiden müssen, V. 39a; vgl. V. 21. Buchstäblich sind diese Weissagungen in Erfüllung gegangen. Und sie gehen immer noch in Erfüllung, z. B. in Rußland. Wahrlich, das Kreuztragen ist kein Kinderspiel!

b. Trotzdem tragen die Kinder Gottes ihrem Heilande das Kreuz geduldig nach. Warum?

1. Weil sie ihren Heiland liebhaben, lieber als Vater oder Mutter, Sohn oder Tochter, V. 37. Er ist ihr ein und alles im Leben und im Sterben, Ps. 73, 25f. Deshalb folgen sie ihm geduldig durch Freud und Leid.

2. Weil sie wissen, daß Glaube und Liebe durchs Kreuz geprüft und bewährt werden, V. 38. Wer kein Kreuzträger sein will, kann auch kein JEsusjünger sein, V. 33. Unter der Kreuzeslast wird der Glaube stärker, die Liebe inniger, die Hoffnung gewisser, Hebr. 12, 7. 11. „So machet er die Kreuzbeschwer zu einem Liebesstricke."

3. Weil sie gewiß sind, daß das Kreuz zur Krone führt. Bedenkt doch, was das heißt: V. 32 und V. 39b. Wahrlich, Röm. 8, 18. Deshalb: 2 Kor. 7, 4; Röm. 12, 12.

Schluß. Laßt uns darum Christum freudig vor seinen Feinden bekennen und ihm das Kreuz geduldig nachtragen! Dann wird er uns auch vor seinem Vater bekennen, und wir werden schließlich zu denen gehören, von denen geschrieben steht: Offenb. 7, 14—17. E. J. F.

Zweiter Sonntag nach Epiphanias.

Joh. 1, 35—42.

Das Ephiphaniasfest, das Fest der Erscheinung Christi, soll uns die selige Wahrheit lehren, daß Christus nicht nur den Juden, sondern auch den Heiden als Heiland erschienen ist. — Christi Erscheinung ist aber nicht nur eine historische Tatsache, die einmal geschehen und damit abgetan ist; er erscheint immer noch dem einzelnen Sünder. Und das ist schließlich die Hauptfrage: Wie erscheint JEsus mir und offenbart sich mir als mein Heiland? Das sollen wir an dem Exempel der ersten Jünger Christi erkennen.

JEsus und seine ersten Jünger.

1. Wie sie zu ihm geführt wurden;
2. was sie bei ihm suchten;
3. was sie bei ihm fanden.

1.

„Des andern Tages"; am vorigen Tage: V. 29—34; am Tage vor dem: V. 19—28. Johannes, ein rechter Wegbereiter Christi, weist das Volk von sich auf Christum; besonders seine Jünger, die er schon für den Dienst Christi vorbereitet hat, Joh. 3, 28—30; Matth. 11, 2. 3. Heute gelingt es; zwei Johannesjünger folgen JEsu nach, Andreas und — ohne Zweifel — Johannes; nachher Simon Petrus.

Wie werden sie zu JEsu geführt? Durch die Predigt von Christo, V. 36. 41. Johannis Wort war ein klares Zeugnis von der Person und dem Amt Christi, im besondern ein Hinweis auf seine Predigt des vorigen Tages, V. 29. 30. Diese Predigt ist mächtig und dringt schließlich durch. Ebenso V. 41.

So heute. Nur durch die Predigt von Christo, dem Lamm Gottes, dem Gekreuzigten, werden Leute bekehrt; nicht durch vage Vorträge über „Gott, Tugend und Unsterblichkeit"; nicht einmal durch Anpreisung des Vorbildes Christi; nur durch die Predigt von der stellvertretenden Genugtuung des Gottmenschen. — Aber durch die Predigt gewiß; darin offenbart sich der Heiland heute noch; dadurch werden Sünder zu ihm geführt.

2.

„Was suchet ihr?" So fragt JEsus, und sie antworten: V. 38. Das meinte: Wo können wir mit dir reden, dir zuhören, mehr von dir lernen? Nicht weltliches Wissen, Ehre bei Menschen, irdisches Gut; sie wären bitter enttäuscht worden, hätten sie das bei Christo gesucht. Sie glauben, daß er das Lamm Gottes ist, das auch ihre Sünde trägt; nun

wollen sie mehr von ihm hören über sein Werk und wie sie daran teilhaben können. Daher bleiben sie den ganzen Tag bei ihm.

Was sollst du bei JEsu suchen, wenn du zu ihm kommst? Nur die alte selige Wahrheit, das er das Lamm Gottes ist, der Heiland, der in die Welt gekommen ist, die Sünder selig zu machen. Wer etwas anderes bei ihm und in seiner Kirche sucht, wird enttäuscht. Zu JEsu muß man kommen im Sinne Marias, Luk. 10, 39, mit der Absicht, aus seinem Wort ihn immer besser als den Heiland kennenzulernen, zu erkennen, was er für uns getan hat und wie wir seiner Wohltaten teilhaftig werden, wie die Erkenntnis dann auch ihren Einfluß auf unser Leben haben soll und kann und wie wir schließlich fröhlich die Augen schließen und ewig zu ihm kommen können.

3.

Wer so zu JEsu kommt, wird nie enttäuscht. So offenbar diese Jünger; sonst wären sie nicht so lange bei JEsu geblieben; Andreas sagte es auch ausdrücklich, V. 41. So selig waren die Stunden, daß sie dem Johannes unauslöschlich im Gedächtnis blieben, V. 39. Sie waren jetzt gewiß, er ist der, der da kommen sollte. Sogleich zeigte sich ihr Glaube auch in ihrem Leben, V. 41. Daß auch Petrus bei JEsu fand, was er suchte: Matth. 16, 16.

Wer zu JEsu kommt, findet erstlich Gewißheit seines eigenen Heils, darum auch rechte Freudigkeit im Leben, rechte Antwort auf alle Fragen des Lebens, Trost und Kraft in allen Stürmen des Lebens; wer nur den ganzen Tag bei JEsu ausharrt, der ist wie Petrus ein Felsenmann; der kann schließlich fröhlich sagen: Luk. 2, 29. 30. — Er findet aber auch seinen rechten Lebenszweck: Mission; nachdem er selber den einigen Heiland gefunden hat, kann er nicht anders, er muß ihn auch andern zeigen. Das ist bei jedem Christen selbstverständlich. Und wer darin diesen Jüngern folgt, findet, daß das Wort Christi in seinem Munde auch kräftig ist und Frucht zum ewigen Leben bringt.

Hast du JEsum gefunden? Suchst du ihn aus seinem Wort immer besser kennenzulernen? Suchst du auch andere zu JEsu zu führen?

T. H.

Septuagesimä.

Luk. 10, 38—42.

„Wenn weit in den Landen wir ziehen umher, wie die Heimat, so finden kein Plätzchen wir mehr." Wie anheimelnd, wie beruhigend klingt schon das Wort Heim! Der Gedanke an das Heim treibt den Vater zu Fleiß und Arbeit in seiner Arbeit an und beschleunigt abends seine Schritte. Der Matrose auf weiter See, der Reisende, den das Dampfroß in rasender Geschwindigkeit dahinführt, der Sohn und die Tochter in ferner Stadt, wie oft eilen die Gedanken zurück ins traute Heim! Das Heim ist ein köstliches Geschenk Gottes, und unter allen Heimen kommt keins dem christlichen Heim gleich.

Mache dein Heim zu einem christlichen Heim!

1. Laß JEsum in dein Heim einkehren!
2. Laß JEsum dein Heim segnen!

1.

V. 38. Ein christliches Heim ist ein Heim, in das JEsus eingekehrt ist. Nicht das Bild JEsu, das an der Wand hängt, macht das Haus zu einem christlichen Heim. Leider fehlt in manchen Christenhäusern unter der Masse der Bilder das Bild des besten Freundes. Aber nicht JEsu Bild, sondern JEsu persönliche Gegenwart macht das Heim zu einem christlichen. Nicht mehr kommt er sichtbar wie damals in Bethanien; durch sein Wort kehrt er ins Herz und damit ins Haus ein, Joh. 14, 23. Willst du Christo die Tür deines Heims öffnen, so folge dem Beispiel der Maria, Text, V. 39, gib JEsu Gelegenheit, in seinem Wort zu dir zu kommen. Es gibt ja auch andere Pflichten für christliche Hausbewohner. Für den Hausvater gilt 1 Tim. 5, 8; für die Hausmutter Spr. 31, 10 ff., für die Kinder 1 Tim. 5, 4. Aber alle diese Pflichten sollen nicht unmöglich machen Kol. 3, 16. Durch Gottes Wort und Gebet sollen wir unsere Alltagspflichten heiligen, daher auch nicht bloß über Tagesneuigkeiten, sondern auch über Gottes Wort und Sachen des Reiches Gottes miteinander reden. Auch nicht versäumen, die Kinder zu JEsu zu bringen, 5 Mos. 6, 6—9. Wenn wir das tun, dann wohnt JEsus in unserm Hause, dann ist unser Heim ein christliches.

2.

JEsus bringt Segen für das Christenheim, Text, V. 39. 42. Maria wurde im Glauben gestärkt. Es ist etwas Herrliches um den Schatz des Gotteswortes. (Ausmalen nach der positiven Seite.)

Martha war in Gefahr, das eine, das not ist, zu vergessen. JEsus warnt und mahnt sie freundlich. Welch ein Segen für die Hausgenossen, jung und alt, wenn brüderliche Bestrafung herrscht, wenn die Kinder schon von Jugend auf vor dem Sündenwesen gewarnt werden! Wie so mancher Gatte ist durch die freundliche Mahnung des Gatten vor Abwegen bewahrt worden!

Marias Teil soll nicht von ihr genommen werden, V. 42. Bald brachen trübe Tage herein, Joh. 11, 1 ff. Doch auch in den trüben Tagen erwies sich JEsus als treuer Hausfreund, 11, 7—44. — JEsus bleibt der beste Hausfreund, selbst wenn alle andern Güter und Schätze verlorengehen. Ihm dürfen wir allezeit unser Herz ausschütten, von ihm uns Trost und Hilfe holen, auch Kraft zum Tragen des Kreuzes und zur Überwindung der Todesfurcht. So wird das christliche Heim zu einer Vorstätte der ewigen Heimat. Darum mache dein Heim zu einem christlichen Heim! T. L.

Sonntag Sexagesimä.

Matth. 16, 13—20.

Gleich nach dem Bekenntnis der Jünger, in unserm Text berichtet, fing JEsus an, von seinem Leiden und Sterben zu ihnen zu reden, V. 21; eine Art Examen, das der HErr mit ihnen anstellte; Hauptinhalt: „Wie dünket euch um Christum?" Nun sie die rechte Erkenntnis von Christi Person haben und bekennen, können sie weiter lernen und recht verstehen, was sein Amt und Werk ist, wie sie sich seine Frucht aneignen und ihrer sich getrösten mögen. — Dies selbe Bekenntnis ist noch immer der rechte Grund der Kirche und wird es auch immer bleiben.

Der Grund, worauf die Kirche sicher ruht.

1. Welches dieser Grund ist;
2. warum die Kirche darauf sicher ruht.

1.

V. 13. 15. Ein Bekenntnis ist nötig. Wo JEsus in seinem Wort erscheint, kann niemand neutral bleiben, Luk. 11, 23. — Von denen, die Christum ganz und gar verwerfen, wollen wir gar nicht reden; aber nicht einmal jedes Bekenntnis von Christo ist recht, V. 14. Nur das unumwundene Bekenntnis, V. 16, nimmt der HErr als richtig an und nennt es den Grund, worauf er seine Kirche bauen will.

Wer, sagen die Leute, daß des Menschen Sohn sei, die Leute, die sich nach ihm Christen nennen? Ein großer Wegbereiter, der erste, der der Menschheit gewisse Wahrheiten, von Gottes Liebe usw., geoffenbart hat; aber der rechte Messias ist noch zu erwarten oder ist später erschienen (Christian Science). Ein großer Prophet, Moral- und Tugendlehrer, social reformer. In jedem Fall ein Mensch wie alle andern, wenn auch besser. Ist das genug?

V. 15. 16. Dies Bekenntnis haben die Jünger oft abgelegt, Joh. 1, 49; 6, 69; 20, 28; 1 Joh. 4, 15 usw. Es ist kein Mißverständnis möglich. Ein klares Bekenntnis zu seiner Gottheit, seiner Wesenseinheit mit dem Vater, das ist das Bekenntnis, das JEsus den Grund seiner Kirche nennt.

2.

Auf diesem Fels ruht die Kirche und jedes Glied der Kirche sicher. Warum?

Es ist göttliche Offenbarung, V. 27, das einmütige Zeugnis der Heiligen Schrift. Es ist das Selbstzeugnis Christi; er nimmt das Zeugnis der Jünger an und lobt es, V. 17; Joh. 20, 28, und spricht es selber direkt aus, Matth. 26, 63. 64.

Auf dieser Wahrheit ruht das ganze Werk Christi. Nur Gott selbst konnte die Menschheit erlösen. Wer diese Wahrheit preisgibt, hat keinen Heiland.

Auf dieſer Wahrheit ruht die ganze Wirkſamkeit der Kirche. Gott allein kann Sünden vergeben; iſt Chriſtus wahrer Gott, ſo iſt, V. 19, die Predigt des Evangeliums, die Predigt von der Vergebung der Sünden, kräftig.

Auf dieſer Wahrheit ruht der Kirche Hoffnung für die Zukunft, V. 18b; Röm. 8, 31.

V. 16 iſt unſer Bekenntnis von Chriſto. Laſſen wir uns nicht zum Abfall bewegen, weder einzeln noch als Kirche! T. H.

Miscellanea.

Exegetica Est Regina.

Es wird der lutheriſchen Kirche oft vorgeworfen, und unter Umſtänden mit mehr als einem Schein des Rechts, daß ſie gleichſam als Motto geſetzt habe: Dogmatica est regina. Die ſcheinbare Richtigkeit dieſes Urteils wird manchmal beſtätigt durch die Betonung, die wir mit Recht auf die Dogmatik als Lehrſyſtem legen. Wahr iſt auch, daß einzelne Dogmatiker Bibelſprüche aus ihrem Zuſammenhang herausgeriſſen haben, um ſie als Beweisſtellen anzuführen bei loci, wo ſie nicht hingehören. So findet man mitunter 2 Kor. 3, 5 als Beweisſpruch bei der Lehre von der Bekehrung und 1 Kor. 2, 9 als Beweisſpruch für die Lehre vom ewigen Leben. Aber ſchließlich ſind das doch nur einzelne Fälle, und die lutheriſche Dogmatik hat ſich, beſonders in der Anfangszeit, nicht mit ſolchen Gewaltſtreichen abgegeben. Die Dogmatik iſt nicht ein Prokruſtesbett, in das man Schriftſtellen auf Grund vorgefaßter Meinungen zwingt, ſondern eine ſyſtematiſche Darlegung der Schriftlehre. Die beſte Weiſe des theologiſchen Studiums iſt dieſe, daß man von der Exegeſe ausgeht, ſodann die Lehren in der Form der bibliſchen Theologie zuſammenträgt und endlich die ſo gefundenen Wahrheiten in ſyſtematiſcher Weiſe zuſammenſtellt. Luthers Faſſung der Regel Exegetica est regina findet ſich in ſeinem „Großen Bekenntnis vom Abendmahl Chriſti“ und lautet ſo: „Man ſoll in der Schrift die Worte laſſen gelten, was ſie lauten nach ihrer Art, und keine andere Deutung geben, es zwinge denn ein öffentlicher Artikel des Glaubens.“ (XX, 1003.) Vgl. ſeine Worte zu Gen. 41, 40, § 151. (II, 1380.) Man beachte auch, wie fein D. Pieper in ſeiner „Chriſtlichen Dogmatik“ dieſe Weiſe befolgt hat. K.

Americanizing the Bible.

There have been men who have criticized us for our conservative stand concerning the Authorized Version. In fact, some attempts have been made to introduce the Revised Version or the American Standard Version into our congregations. But it is one thing to acknowledge certain linguistic corrections in a later translation, and it is quite another thing to have our people use a version which shows clear concessions to the modern spirit of unbelief, the denial of many Messianic prophecies, especially Job 19, 25—27, and much of the supernatural element in the New Testament. And as for the most recent translation of the Old Testament by Dr. J. M. Powis Smith, following the new translation of the New Tes-

tament by Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed, even our newspapers are skeptical, as the *Literary Digest* of October 24 reports. Says the *Camden Courier-Post:* "Perhaps it will be an advance upon the King James Version, and perhaps it will prove one more effort to gild the lily." This from the *Boston Herald:* "A rewriting of the Bible is about as difficult a task as a rephrasing of Shakespeare or a modernization of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address or his letter to Mrs. Bixby. . . . The world has known and loved the King James Version so long that there will be a passive resistance everywhere to a text which differs from the original mainly in its greater measure of erudition." The *Chicago Sunday Tribune* of October 11 gives a few samples of the new translation of the Old Testament, quoting from Ps. 23: "He gives me new life, He guides me in safe paths for His fame's sake"; from Is. 1, 18: "If your sins be like scarlet, can they be as white as snow? If they be red like crimson, can they become as wool?" and from Eccl. 12: "And the caperberry becomes ineffectual, because man goes to his final home. . . . Futility of futilities, says Koheleth, all is futility." It surely seems to be if that is intended to be an improvement upon the King James Version. The entire situation with regard to modern revisions of the Bible caused the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* to remark editorially on October 4: "Those who can remember the profound impression made by the Revised New Testament in 1881 probably never imagined that the fiftieth year of its use would pass in virtual public indifference, with only occasional mention of its origin and history. . . . Curiously enough, as the *London Times* remarks, the faults of the Revised Edition were largely due to the translators' imperfect knowledge, not of Greek, but of English! . . . They lacked the ear and feeling for the delicate structure of great English. With no sense of guilt, but rather of piety, they sacrificed noble diction on the altar of theories about the Greek aorist." We have graver charges against the Revised Version, as we have them against other late translations, than those of language alone, as has been intimated above. A very careful comparison made a number of years ago, using the Greek text of the New Testament, the Revised Version, the American Standard Version, and the Rheims-Douai Version, showed that in at least 80 per cent. of the cases the Authorized Version was preferable and that in no case was there evidence of influence in favor of liberal views. We still cling to the Authorized Version for all purposes but that of study; for it is far easier to substitute an occasional modern word than to explain passages where mistranslations have been introduced in the interest of Modernism. K.

Kinder — Werke.

Eine Frage ist eingelaufen betreffs Matth. 11, 19, verglichen mit Luk. 7, 35. Luther hat an beiden Stellen übersetzt: „Die Weisheit muß sich rechtfertigen lassen von ihren Kindern", und die englische Authorized Version setzt gleichfalls an beiden Stellen: "Wisdom is justified of her children", während die englische Revised Version im Texte hat: "of her works" (Matth. 11, 19), "of her children" (Luk. 7, 35), dabei aber doch zu der Matthäusstelle bemerkt: "Many ancient authorities read *children*." Es scheint gewiß zu sein, daß die Lesart der Matthäusstelle *ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων* ist und daß wir es nicht mit zwei verschiedenen Ereignissen zu tun haben.

Nach der hermeneutischen Regel Lectio difficilior praeferenda sollten wir uns wenigstens mit der Lösung dieser Schwierigkeit befassen. Eine solche, und zwar eine recht annehmbare, bietet Meyer in seinem Buche „JEsu Muttersprache", worin er bekanntlich den Nachweis führt, daß der Heiland sich in der Regel der aramäischen Sprache bedient habe. Demnach hätte er hier den Ausdruck gebraucht: ab'daha, Täter der Weisheit, oder abdaha, Knechte der Weisheit, woraus leicht in der mündlichen Überlieferung obadaha oder abidataha werden konnte, Werke der Weisheit. Als der Heilige Geist die Evangelien in griechischer Sprache aufzeichnen ließ, nahm er beide Wendungen in die Heilige Schrift auf, und wir berücksichtigen daher auch beide bei der Auslegung der Harmonie des Lebens JEsu. K.

Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

Aus unserm Seminar. Die durch D. F. Piepers Abscheiden entstandene Lücke im Lehrerpersonal des Seminars macht sich noch in mancher Hinsicht bemerkbar. Prof. D. L. Fürbringer, der achtunddreißig Jahre lang der Kollege des Entschlafenen war, ist als sein Nachfolger erwählt worden und wurde am 18. November v. J. feierlich in sein Amt eingeführt. Dadurch, daß Prof. D. Engelder die Dogmatik in der zweiten und in der Kandidatenklasse übernommen hat, während ein Teil seiner bisherigen Arbeit auf andere verteilt wurde, ist es möglich gemacht worden, für dieses Schuljahr von der Besetzung der entstandenen Vakanz Abstand zu nehmen, was in Anbetracht der obwaltenden ökonomischen Verhältnisse auch annehmbar schien. Aber die Größe der Klassen ist noch immer ein unliebsamer Umstand, besonders wenn die einzelnen Lehrer nach Wunsch der Synode nicht lediglich diktieren oder vortragen, sondern auch Textbücher gebrauchen und schriftliche Arbeiten in der Stunde und außerhalb der Stunde anfertigen lassen. Wenn die Klassen im regelmäßigen Kursus bis zu 80 Studenten zählen (trotz der stattgefundenen Teilung) und die in einzelnen Wahlfächern bis zu 135, dann ist es sehr schwer, auf den einzelnen Studenten zu achten und ihn zu selbständigen Leistungen heranzuziehen. — Die mit der großen Studentenzahl verbundenen Schwierigkeiten, auch was die Beköstigung der jungen Männer anlangt, sind zum Teil gehoben durch intensivere Arbeit sowie durch das Zusammendrängen des Schuljahres, jedoch unter Beibehaltung der von der Synode angeordneten Anzahl von Schultagen. Die früheren Scheuertage sind im neuen Seminar hingefallen, und die Eintagskonferenz findet, soweit dies tunlich ist, an Ferientagen statt. Auch die Osterferien sind in den letzten Jahren vermindert worden auf Gründonnerstag, Karfreitag und Ostermontag. Die durch derartige Bestimmungen gewonnenen ca. zwei Schulwochen kommen der Studentenschaft und der Synode zugute: ersterer, weil durch intensivere Arbeit mehr geleistet wird; letzterer, weil, was Beköstigung der Studenten und ihr Wohnen im Seminar anbetrifft, auf so viel weniger Tage zu rechnen ist. Die Redaktionsarbeit der Professoren an den von der Synode herausgegebenen Zeitschriften geht natürlich im Winter und im Sommer weiter, und es erscheinen keine Doppelnummern mehr wie früher. — Der auf Beschluß der Synode eingerichtete Korrespondenzkursus des Seminars ist, wie es scheint, noch nicht

überall bekannt. Einige hundert Pastoren haben sich einschreiben lassen, von denen viele die ihnen gebotene Gelegenheit in ausgiebigem Maße und mit ausgezeichnetem Erfolge verwerten. Die eine Tatsache schon, daß man genötigt ist, in systematischer Weise zu arbeiten und seine Zeit recht auszukaufen, ist für viele ein Ansporn. Aber auch ein anderer Vorteil, der sich daraus ergibt, ist nicht zu verachten, daß nämlich die Bibliothek dieses Departements den eingeschriebenen Pastoren unter überaus günstigen Bedingungen zur Verfügung steht. Man lasse sich das Informationsbüchlein kommen. K.

"The Weakness of Theological Education." — Speaking before the Third Conference on Preaching of the Boston University School of Theology, Carl Wallace Petty, minister of the First Baptist Church of Pittsburgh, offered the following criticism of modern theological education: —

"Our seminaries have come in for some criticism in late years concerning the kind of preparation offered students for the ministry. The result of the criticism has been generally a revision of the curricula. To some of us that has seemed peculiar. It has not been the content of theological training that has caused the bother. It hurts no preacher to be able to distinguish between a *piel* and a *hitpael* or to make the verbs in the third chapter of the Epistle to Romans. Knowledge concerning the early heresies of the Church is useful. . . . It is rather the fact that so many students leave their schools with a vast lot of preparation that they do not know what to do with. The diet appears to be all right, but the metabolic process seems to have broken down. They are in the position in which a young medical man would find himself who, though well instructed in diagnosis, anatomy, and pathology and owning a fine kit of surgical instruments, should be thrust into surgery with no technique for exploring an abdomen or operating on a mastoid. What a technique is to a surgeon a synthesis is to the preacher. All preparation for the ministry has just one objective — it is to keep God contemporary and discover ways of making Him available for the needs of men and society. The weakness of theological education, if weakness it has, is not so much in the content of its curriculum as in its failure to create in the mind of the young preacher that synthetizing process by which what a man knows can be put to work at the task of bringing a world of striving, seeking, selfish people in touch with the spiritual resources of the universe." (*Contemporary Preaching*, p. 21 f.)

We are here confronted with a perennial problem — how to convert theoretical knowledge into practical ability. While it is self-evident that all theological instruction should be given with due regard for its future practical use by the students, the fact remains that practical ability must be acquired in the school of experience. In view of this fact our theological students are being encouraged to serve as supplies before finishing their course at the seminary. E. J. F.

Professor Price's "Apologia pro fide mea." — In the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of October, 1931, appears a remarkable article, in which Prof. George McCready Price of Emmanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs, Mich., using the title indicated in our heading, discusses his attitude toward the conclusions of evolutionary scientists. He is an ardent and well-informed student of geology and has become famous as a defender of the inerrancy

of the Bible. His article, to quote the chief statements, sets forth these views. The problem of origins remains still unsolved so far as natural science and philosophy are concerned. The differences between the views of the various advocates of evolution show that permanent truth has not yet been found by them. Since the Bible always speaks of creation as a *finished* work and not as something now going on, we cannot expect to find in the present order of nature any information as to how the world came into existence. We have God's revelation in the Bible, telling of the beginning of things. Nature is another book God has given us, a book second only to the Bible. All naturalistic schemes of accounting for the first appearance of the primary forms of life have failed. Pasteur's patient work has branded as unscientific all speculation regarding the spontaneous origin of life. A definite creation of the first forms of all the distinct kinds of plants and animals is imperatively demanded by clear thinking on the facts of biology. — As far as the time consumed by Creation is concerned, natural science as such can tell us nothing of permanent value. The serial arrangement of the fossils as submitted by biologists is a purely artificial affair, which can be arrived at only by an elaborate process of circular reasoning. It is clear there was one geological age, a previous age of our world, with a very different climate and many other conditions quite opposite to those now prevailing. But the supposed ability of biologists to discriminate among the works of that age, assigning some to one period and some to another, is without any real scientific value. All the true fossils may have been living contemporaneously in the same world. When trilobites and graptolites are found occurring *underneath* dinosaurs and mammals in some localities and *above* them in others, with no physical evidences of any subsequent disturbance in either cases, it is self-evident that all these forms of life must have been living contemporaneously in that ancient world. This of course does not *prove* their simultaneous origin or creation. Belief that there was such a simultaneous origin rests not on science, but on revelation. The Bible, with its affirmation of a fiat creation, gives us the only method which will stand a philosophic or scientific analysis. God's wish or God's thought must be the ultimate cause of both the origin and the continued existence of things. Modern physics, with its apparent proof of the equivalence of matter and energy, would seem to be getting very near to this idea. — And with respect to conditions before the Flood the geological proof of a mild, equable climate over the entire earth, even within the polar regions, is unequivocal. The complete earth-ruin wrought by the Flood is attested not only by the Bible, but by the rocky record of all the lands of the globe, the strata of which testify to wholly abnormal conditions in their deposition. A further proof of the universality of the Flood is furnished by the ease and the completeness with which this idea unlocks those perplexities and problems which have so long been used as an excuse for the theory of organic evolution. Science indeed does not demonstrate that the Flood was the cause of the geological changes recorded in the strata, but the scientific evidence compels us to believe in a great world-catastrophe of some sort and of quite indefinable dimensions. It is important to note that in the Flood we have a sufficient solution for all those geological and biological puzzles which have been relied upon as the chief proof of

organic evolution. The crucial test of any scientific or philosophical theory must always, for the Christian, be its agreement or disagreement with the Bible. Any theory of man's animal origin must deny man's primal innocence and hence the doctrine of the fall of man, and if the Fall is denied, the entire doctrine of the atonement and the sacrificial death of Christ.

While we regret very much that Professor Price, as a Seventh-day Adventist, rejects clear teachings of the Holy Scriptures, we are grateful to him for his valiant defense of the inerrancy of the first chapters of our Bible, showing that the attacks of hostile critics, which are largely based on geological data, are unjustified. A.

The Itch for Public Attention. — In the *Forum*, Robert G. M. Neville has published an article giving a very drastic commentary on the publicity itch with which many preachers in our day are troubled. He writes: —

"The time can be recalled by living men when the virus of publicity had not bitten the average priest, rector, or divine; when there were no sermon pages on which his Sabbatical conclusions could be recorded for posterity; when no church committees on press relations pleaded with exasperated city editors for space; and when no handsomely paid publicity agents threatened withdrawal of advertising if the paper refused to exhibit curiosity in their clerical clients.

"But alas! that day has vanished. That was a time when churches, like physicians, disdained to spend huge sums of money to advertise their services in the mundane press. It was a time when the press, yet to be won over to the ways of God, refused to recognize that religion was as important as the theater, sports, and finance and to give it equal space. It was a time before modern high-pressure methods had been invented and before publicity, which started with the somewhat shady dealings of the circus, had found an unimpeachable and lucrative client in the representatives of God on earth.

"While the coverage of religious news is now a fever with almost every paper in every part of the country, the regard of the nation's press for religion — and of the pastors for the press — is epitomized by the situation in New York. The Mecca of missionaries from all ends of the earth, the parish of apostles of new religions by the score, and the headquarters of dozens of ecclesiastical organizations, this modern Gomorrah maintains a daily press obsessed with religious zeal.

"The *New York Times*, for example, finds it profitable to pay twenty-five reporters — many of them from the Columbia School of Journalism — $3.25 apiece for worshiping on Sunday, besides maintaining a religious editor to ferret out religious happenings throughout the week. The *Herald Tribune*, which outprints the *Times* on sermons, sends out a group of men to invade the churches for news every Sunday and dispatches its staff of copy boys to fill in.

"This sudden bursting into hallelujahs by the Fourth Estate has been welcomed fervently by the ministers. Often they are ready with extracts of their moral dissertations to hand to the reporters, and more often they apprise the press in advance of any unusual happenings in their congregations.

"Ever vigilant, scanning religious columns with the eye of a hawk,

the publicity agents, secretaries, and press committees intervene in person in the name of the Church and God when their releases repeatedly fail to appear in print.

"Suspicious newspaper men have begun to believe that sermons are not preached for the salvation of a sinful humanity so much as for exploitation by a wayward press and that some parish activities originate not so much out of a love of God as a penchant for publicity.

"There are some ministers, God bless them, who still ignore the press and stick to the Gospel. There are others who profess to despise publicity, but nevertheless contend that they must stoop to conquer, that the church must publicize itself to the fullest extent in order to compete with amusements. The skeptics at the press bench cannot help feeling, however, that the personal ambition of the men of God is the most potent factor in religious news. A divine who prefers to remain in his parish and minister solely to his flock, never venturing into the wider world of the press, may conceivably enter the kingdom of God with full honors, but he will never become a Park Avenue rector with a salary of $20,000 a year, nor will he be elected a moderator or bishop." W. G. P.

The Episcopalians at Denver. — Whatever the Episcopalians may have accomplished when they met in their triennial convention at Denver last year, they cannot complain that the newspapers did not take sufficient cognizance of their gathering and report with comparative fulness the convention news to the general public. To judge by the many times the assembly was mentioned on the first page of the daily papers, great things must have been achieved. Alas! the convention debated rather at length the question of marriage and divorce; hence the wide-spread interest in its proceedings. The points at issue had to do chiefly with the view the Church should take of the remarriage of divorced persons and their admission to the Sacrament. After much discussion a new marriage canon was adopted, which in the *Christian Century* is summarized thus: "Courts may be established in dioceses to hear appeals for nullity on nine grounds; if nullification is granted, appellants may remarry; also to review cases of divorce obtained on the ground of adultery, which, if heard favorably, will permit remarriage; to hear pleas for reinstatement as communicants in good standing of persons who have remarried after having been divorced." The innovation is the provision looking to the establishment of ecclasiastical courts to determine whether certain marriages should be declared null and void and whether in other cases a divorce may be granted. It will be noted that these courts, according to the new canon, *may* be established; in other words, the establishment is optional, resting with the decision of each diocese. If these courts were to function as advisory bodies, assisting pastors and congregations in arriving at Scriptural, God-pleasing conclusions in difficult cases, nobody could object to them; but since they, wherever established, are to *decide* questions which really belong to the jurisdiction of congregations, the provision is an unwarranted intrusion into the sphere of the rights and privileges belonging to the local congregations.

The much-discussed issue which was raised by the preparation of a new missal, the so-called American missal, which is quite Roman in its complexion, was sidestepped in a manner satisfactory to both the Roman

and the Evangelical party. The book was not condemned, as the former party feared might be done, nor was its use authorized, the convention decreeing that the certificate of the custodian of the Book of Common Prayer must not appear in the new missal. The certificate referred to is found in every authorized copy of the Book of Common Prayer and briefly declares that the particular copy has been compared with "a certified copy of the standard book and conforms thereto." Those who are in love with Romanism will simply use the book, justifying their course by reminding themselves and others that the convention did not forbid the introduction of the new missal, though it had an opportunity to do so, and the enemies of Romanism will assert that they have saved their Church from Popery by withholding recognition of the new book. It is a farce. *Num risum tenetis, amici?*

It seems not unimportant that our clergy should be in possession of the *ipsissima verba* of the marriage canon adopted by the Episcopalian convention, and therefore we append it here, taking it over from the *Lutheran:* —

"*Of the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony:* —

"Section I. Ministers of this Church shall, within their cures, give instruction, both publicly and privately, on the nature of holy matrimony, its responsibilities, and the mutual love and forbearance which it requires.

"Section II. Ministers of this Church shall conform to the laws of the State, governing the civil contract of marriage, and also to the laws of this Church, governing the solemnization of holy matrimony.

"Section III. (1). No minister of this Church shall solemnize any marriage before the following conditions have been carefully complied with:

"(A). He shall ascertain by due inquiry the right of the parties, according to the laws of this Church, to contract a marriage.

"(B). He shall instruct the contracting parties as to the nature of holy matrimony, its responsibilities, and the means of grace which God has provided through His Church.

"(2). There shall be at least two witnesses present at the solemnization of the marriage.

"(3). Every minister shall without delay formally record in the proper register the name, age, and residence of each party. Such record shall be signed by the minister who solemnizes the marriage, by the married parties, and by at least two witnesses of the marriage.

"(4). No marriage shall be solemnized by a minister of this Church unless the intention of the contracting parties shall have been signified to the minister at least three days before the service of solemnization.

"Section IV. If one party to a marriage so grievously offend the other that the security of permanence of the home is imperiled, it shall be the duty of the offended party to lay the matter before a minister of the Church; and it shall be the duty of such minister to labor that the parties may be reconciled.

"Section V. No minister knowingly, after due inquiry, shall solemnize the marriage of any person who has been or is the husband or the wife of any other person then living from whom he or she has been divorced for any cause arising after marriage.

"Nor shall it be lawful for any member of this Church to enter upon

a marriage when either of the contracting parties is the husband or the wife of any other person then living from whom he or she has been divorced for any cause arising after marriage.

"But this canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery, provided that before the application for such remarriage a period of not less than one year shall have elapsed after the granting of such divorce and that satisfactory evidence touching the facts in the case, including a copy of the court's decree and record, if practicable, with proof that the defendant was personally served or appeared in the action, be laid before the ecclesiastical authority and such ecclesiastical authority, having taken legal advice thereon, shall have declared in writing that in his judgment the case of the applicant conforms to the requirements of this canon; and provided, further, that it shall be within the discretion of any minister to decline to solemnize any marriage.

"Section VI. (1). Any person whose former marriage has been annulled or dissolved by a civil court may apply to the bishop or to the ecclesiastical court, constituted by canon, of the diocese or missionary district of the said person's domicile, to have the said marriage declared null and void by reason of any of the following impediments to marriage:

"I. Consanguinity (whether of the whole or of the half blood) within the following degrees: —

"(A). One may not marry one's ascendant or descendant.

"(B). One may not marry one's sister.

"(C). One may not marry the sister or brother of one's ascendant or the descendant of one's brother or sister.

"II. Lack of free consent of their party.

"III. Mistake as to the identity of either party.

"IV. Mental deficiency of either party sufficient to prevent the exercise of intelligent choice.

"V. Insanity of either party.

"VI. Failure of either party to have reached the age of puberty.

"VII. Impotence of either party undisclosed to the other.

"VIII. The existence of venereal disease in either party.

"IX. Facts which would make the proposed marriage bigamous.

"(2). The bishop in each case, after taking legal advice thereon of the ecclesiastical court proceeding in accordance with the canons and acting through the bishop, shall render judgment in writing to the petitioner. All judgments rendered under this canon by the bishop or the ecclesiastical court shall be made matters of permanent record in the archives of the diocese or missionary district.

"No such judgment shall be construed as referring in any way to the legitimacy of children or the civil validity of the former relationship.

"(3). Any person whose former marriage has been annulled or dissolved by a civil court and pronounced null by the bishop may be married by a minister of this Church as if he had never previously been married.

"Section VII. (1). If any minister of this Church shall have cause to think that a person desirous of holy Baptism or of confirmation or of receiving the holy Communion has been married otherwise than as the Word of God and discipline of this Church allows, such minister, before receiving such person to these ordinances, shall refer the case to the bishop for his godly judgment thereupon.

"The bishop, after due inquiry into the circumstances and taking into consideration of the godly discipline both of justice and of mercy, shall give his judgment thereon in writing.

"Provided, however, that no minister shall in any case refuse these ordinances to a penitent person in imminent danger of death.

"(2). Any persons who have been married by civil authority or otherwise than as this Church provides may apply to the bishop or to the ecclesiastical court of their domicile for the recognition of communicant status or for the right to apply for holy Baptism or confirmation.

"After due inquiry into all the facts relevant thereto judgment shall be given in writing to the petitioners by the bishop or by the ecclesiastical court acting through the bishop.

"In case of a favorable decision a minister of this Church may, at his discretion, bless the parties to the union." A.

The Kurtzian Formula for Church Union. — The *Lutheran* of August 13, 1931, says editorially: "In the second volume of our file of the *Lutheran Observer* and soon after Dr. Benjamin Kurtz became its editor in 1833, Dr. Kurtz replied to a letter from a layman who inquired as to the possibility of uniting the Lutheran and German Reformed churches. The correspondent stated that several Lutheran and Reformed persons (laymen, we suspect) had met to consider a combination of the two communions and had not suffered as a result. The editor was asked his opinion and replied that he favored union 'provided it can be accomplished in accordance with the wishes of the great body of the respective churches.'" Dr. B. Kurtz, it is well known, was a radical unionist. He felt no qualms of conscience for attending the German Reformed General Synod as a delegate from the Lutheran General Synod. "Foremost and boldest among the Reformed theologians within the General Synod were S. S. Schmucker and B. Kurtz, who nevertheless insisted on sailing under the Lutheran flag. Brazenly claiming to be the true representatives of Lutheranism, they at the same time assailed the Lutheran and defended the Reformed doctrines with ultra-Calvinistic zeal and bigotry." (*American Lutheranism*, II, p. 69.) Dr. Spaeth said: "For years and years he [Dr. Kurtz] was indefatigable in his coarse and irreverential, yea, blasphemous attacks upon what was set forth as most sacred in the Confessions of the Lutheran Church." (*L. c.*, p. 71.) There can thus be no doubt as to the meaning of his formula for bringing about the union of the two churches. All that is needed is the will of the people.

The *Lutheran* is not adverse to the Kurtzian formula. The editorial states: "We admire the editorial craftsmanship of our brilliant predecessor Dr. Kurtz when he stated that he would advocate a combination 'provided it can be accomplished in accordance with the wishes of the great body of the respective churches.' A union of these German-speaking people in the period prior to the great trek of Germans to the United States and Canada from 1840 to 1895 would have been most expedient. On the surface it would have been the sensible thing to do, and the average layman would probably have accepted the advice of his pastor had the latter urged an organic union between the Reformed and Lutheran groups. But there are fundamental differences of doctrinal conviction between the confessions of the Lutheran and Reformed churches that are keenly discerned by those

on both sides, not only by the ministers, but also by the laity who are above the average. . . . Any layman of reasonably keen intelligence can analyze the catechisms of Luther and Heidelberg to a point where he will choose between the two. Any proposal to unite the Reformed and Lutheran synods would bring on such an analysis, and no compromise by a composite formula would satisfy either. . . . Is a union a present possibility? We do not know the views of our contemporary, the *Reformed Church Messenger*, and its editor, Dr. Paul Leinbach. We ourselves would not be adverse to the Kurtzian formula. If the majorities of the two communions *could* come to a sincere agreement on points of difference, the combination would be of great value. But it would be a negotiation requiring great frankness and sincerity, first among the leaders and later among the constituents. At present the relationships of the Reformed Church are closer to the Presbyterian than to the Lutheran communion."

We do not know what to make of this. The editor of the *Lutheran* "would not be adverse to the Kurtzian formula." And in the next sentence he states that "if the majorities of the two communions *could* come to a sincere agreement on points of difference, the combination would be of great value." But that and the repudiation of a "compromise by a composite formula" is not the Kurtzian formula. That is, if we strike out the reference to "the majorities," the Pauline formula. A church union of the right sort is brought about when a Scriptural agreement on the points of difference is arrived at. Dr. Kurtz does not mention Scripture. According to his formula the "wishes of the great body of the respective churches" decide the matter. We do not see how the platform "No compromise by a composite formula" and the Kurtzian formula can be harmonized. In negotiating a church union on the basis of the elimination of all error, on the no-compromise basis, any favorable mention of the Kurtzian formula is out of place. It can only serve to revive the spirit of 1833. The Kurtzian formula should not be revived. It should be left in the *limbus* of evil spirits.

What does Dr. Paul Leinbach of the *Reformed Church Messenger* make of the Kurtzian formula? He responded to the *Lutheran's* remarks in an editorial headed "Our Friends, the Lutherans," which the *Lutheran* of September 17 reprints. His rejoinder contains the following: "The *Messenger* believes that our fellow-editor is perfectly safe in adopting what he calls the 'Kurtzian formula.' *We can accept it also without any mental reservation whatsoever.*" (Italics in the *Messenger.*) "*Indeed, we suspect it would not be so difficult for us to go half-way in the process of getting together as it would be for our friends, the Lutherans.*" (Italics our own.) That looks like a "compromise by a composite formula." Particularly as he adds: "The things that divide us, which still loom large in the minds of some theologians and editors, are of comparatively little moment to the great mass of the people." There speaks the indifferentist, the unionist. And he accepts the Kurtzian formula in that sense. In what sense does the *Lutheran* accept it? E.

Why the Southern Presbyterians will Not Unite with the Northern Presbyterians. — It has long been known that the Presbyterians of the South are much more conservative than those of the North. Wherein their conservatism consists and why they will not unite with the

Northern Presbyterians is told in an article by Dr. Wm. Crowe in the *Presbyterian* of September 3, 1931, as it has been reprinted in the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*. Dr. Crowe says: —

"In the North, emphasis is laid upon church administration; in the South it is laid upon doctrine. Therefore, when Southern Presbyterians speak of organic union, they are talking about a unity in belief; whereas in the North, in discussing the same subject, the thought in mind is community in government. The development of this differing emphasis may be discovered in a brief review of the history of Presbyterianism reaching back through a century and a quarter.

"By the close of the eighteenth century the Presbyterian Church found that it was facing what seemed to be an impossible task as it surveyed the growing cities and communities of the Middle West. It saw that churches would have to be built as the population advanced its frontier beyond the Alleghany Mountains. Therefore the calls for missionaries and for money were pressing. The Presbyterian Church also discovered that it was not alone in this consciousness of inadequate means for the discharge of its multiplying duties. The Congregational Church, its near neighbor, was also laboring under a like burden. Out of this mutual need a partnership was formed, known in history as 'The Plan of Union.'

"It was in 1801 that 'The Plan of Union' was effected, and for more than thirty years these sister churches were united in their endeavor to overtake the growing West with the message of the Gospel. It was discovered, however, that in the main Congregational and Presbyterian home missionaries were not emphasizing the same principle in preaching the Gospel. The Congregational ministers were from New England and were followers of what is known as the New Haven Theology. The Presbyterian ministers were largely from Pennsylvania and New Jersey and were exponents of what is known as the Princeton Theology. The theology of Princeton found its center in certain principles that were considered essential to the conversion of the individual and to the spiritual building of the Church. The New England theologians, the trainers of Congregational missionaries, were not inclined to consider seriously the principles that were dear to the Presbyterian Church. Friction grew between the two schools of thought, which culminated in the severing of the relationship in the year 1837. Out of that disturbance grew two parties in the Presbyterian Church, known as the 'New School' and the 'Old School.' The 'New School' section adhered to the New England system, the 'Old School' stoutly defending the more strictly Calvinistic position. Within a few months the two sections within the Presbyterian Church divided, forming two distinct Presbyterian bodies, with names as above.

"The Civil War came on, with the result that in its opening year the synods of the South were forced to withdraw from the 'Old School' body. This excision was caused by the Southern constituency insisting that the bond of fellowship should be belief rather than the dictates of an administrative body either within or without the Church. From that year to the present the Southern Presbyterian Church has remained an autonomous body.

"Immediately upon the close of the war the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., facing increased responsibilities and with a depleted membership,

owing to the loss of the Southern synods, united within two years with the 'New School' Presbyterian Church. This union was upon the basis of a common administration, the question of doctrine being entirely in eclipse. It is therefore seen that within ten years the great Presbyterian Church had indicated its willingness to surrender the greater principle (that of doctrine) for the less (that of government). To it the system of government had become of more importance than the system of belief. The effect has been that to-day the major idea in the mind of the Church is union on the ground of polity rather than of the principles of the interpretation of the Word of God.

"That which was feared by Dr. Hodge and other conservative leaders in the Presbyterian Church happened as a result of the union between the 'New School' and the 'Old School' churches. From the day of the union until the present 'New School' Theology has been a disturbing factor in the ranks of that Church. For instance, Union Theological Seminary, New York, was a 'New School' seminary. This institution was taken into the Presbyterian Church without any requirement being made that it change its position in theology. This accounts for the historic lack of harmony in the Presbyterian Church in the East. More than that, every 'New School' seminary became a center of theological ferment. Out of these hotbeds influences inimical to the traditions of Presbyterianism have reached the remotest bounds of the Church. . . . The point that we are undertaking to make here is that the Presbyterian Church gives no emphasis to any form of belief when the hour for merging other denominations arrives. It is no wonder, then, that it proclaims its readiness to unite with any Protestant body upon a merely governmental basis. . . .

"For a worthy type of union the Southern Presbyterian Church has always stood. . . . Throughout all the succeeding years the Southern Church has held itself entirely ready to enter into a union that would be born of mutual trust, that would be upon a basis of common faith and of interpretation of the historic symbols of the Church, and that would give major place to the proclamation of the Gospel of Christ. This is all that it has asked. Mere administrative arrangements will never produce the form of union that is pleasing to the Master; and the Southern Assembly knows it." J. H. C. F.

The End of the Macintosh Case. — The editor of the *Christian Century*, Charles Clayton Morrison, in a signed editorial appearing in the *Christian Century* of October 21, 1931, utters this protest: "The end of the Macintosh case is the beginning of the case of every American citizen who cherishes his liberty of conscience under the Constitution. The Supreme Court last week denied the petition for a rehearing. Every native-born citizen is now not only under obligation to bear arms in any war which Congress may declare, whether that war is held to be just or unjust, in accordance with, or contrary to, the will of God, but has impliedly accepted the obligation in virtue of his acceptance of the status and benefits and prerogatives of citizenship. It was under this interpretation of the Constitution that the court refused citizenship to Professor Macintosh, the decisive argument being that, unless he expressly promised to subordinate his conscience to Congress and accepted the will of Congress as the final interpretation of the will of God, his citizenship would be of a privileged

character in comparison with all native-born citizens. Chief justice Hughes and three other members of the court denied this interpretation, and contended that no such implied promise or obligation is imposed by the constitution upon citizens, whether native-born or naturalized. Dr. Macintosh will not be admitted to citizenship. . . . How many Presbyterian citizens will agree that they no longer hold with their two-century-old confession of faith that 'God alone is Lord of conscience and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His Word, or beside it, in matters of faith and worship,' so that to believe such doctrines or to obey such commandments out of conscience is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring of an implicit faith and an absolute and blind obedience 'is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also'? How many Baptist citizens, remembering the suffering and persecution of their fathers in order that conscience might be freed from control by the State, will now supinely admit that their citizenship under our Constitution places upon them the obligation to accept an enactment of Congress as the definitive revelation of the will of God, from which conscience has no appeal? How many Jewish citizens, whose religion rests upon the divine command, 'Thou shalt have no other gods before Me,' will consent that their citizenship in the United States is conditioned upon their having given the pledge that they will put the will of the State before the will of the living God? . . . How many readers of the *Christian Century* will consent that the Supreme Court shall tear out of their Bible the foundation text of all ethical and spiritual religion, 'We ought to obey God rather than men'?"

The Lutherans have this to say in the Sixteenth Article of the Augsburg Confession: "Of civil affairs they teach that lawful civil ordinances are good works of God and that it is right for Christians to bear civil office, to sit as judges, to judge matters by the imperial and other existing laws, to award just punishments, to engage in just wars, to serve as soldiers. . . . Christians are necessarily bound to obey their own magistrates and laws, save only when commanded to sin; for then they ought to obey God rather than men, Acts 5, 29." And, in the Formula of Concord, Art. III, Epitome, § 11: "One is not to imagine a faith of such a kind as can exist and abide with, and alongside of, a wicked intention to sin and to act against the conscience."

The editorial closes thus: "For one, I, a native-born citizen of the United States, will not give my assent to this new doctrine. I will give everything I have for the well-being of the State, including my life, but I cannot give my conscience. That belongs to God. I repudiate the obligation which the Supreme Court would impose upon me and declare that the imposition of such an obligation is the essence of tyranny. I refuse to be bound by it. Charles Clayton Morrison." E.

Build Your Sermon Like a Cathedral. — This is the advice given by Fred Winslow Adams, professor in the Boston University School of Theology. He says: "If the preacher can build his sermon like a cathedral, with its fluted columns and groined arches arising more like the growth of a living thing than piled masonry, bringing a pervasive sense of wonder, mystery, and the manifold grace of God; if the preacher can project his theme like the Gothic arches over doors and windows, as hands lifted in

prayer; if he can make his illustrations like the celestial fire of cathedral glass, responding to the sunshine and reflecting the glory of God; if he can develop his sermons like a cathedral's open doors, veritable pathways of erring man to the altar of redeeming love; if, I say, the preacher can build his sermon like a cathedral, the symbol of the kingdom of God on earth, he shall know what it is to preach as an ambassador of Christ." (*Contemporary Preaching*, The Abingdon Press, p. 146.) E. J. F.

Reducing the Synodical Overhead by Merging and Closing Schools. — According to the *Kirchenblatt*, the budget committee of the American Lutheran Church has resolved to recommend to the general convention in 1932 that the synodical overhead be reduced by closing the schools at Petersburg, W. Va., and Eureka, S. Dak., by merging the institutions at St. Paul, Minn., Clinton and Waverly, Iowa, and Hebron, Nebr., and by merging the theological seminaries now maintained at St. Paul, Columbus, and Dubuque, at the last-named place. E. J. F.

II. Ausland.

„Groteske Logik" der Miſſourier. Das Folgende entnehmen wir dem „Elſäſſiſchen Lutheraner", der unter dieſer Überſchrift ſchreibt: Groteske Logik iſt eine „ſonderbare, komiſche, verdrehte" Logik. In einer Auseinanderſetzung zwiſchen dem Organ des Bibelbundes „Nach dem Geſetz und Zeugnis" und dem „Oldenburger Sonntagsblatt" wird eine ſolche Logik den vielgeſchmähten Miſſouriern zugeſchrieben. Da uns die Auseinanderſetzung auch um ihres eigentlichen Gegenſtandes willen intereſſiert, ſo ſei ſie hier kurz mitgeteilt. In der Auguſtnummer 1931 von „Nach dem Geſetz und Zeugnis" leſen wir unter der Überſchrift „So geht man mit unſerer Bibel um" unter anderm folgendes:

„Da ſchickt uns ein altes, treues Mitglied unſers Bibelbundes das vom Geh. Oberkirchenrat Iben herausgegebene ‚Oldenburger Sonntagsblatt' vom 3. Mai 1931 zu. Hier finden wir auf Seite 142 einen Artikel ‚Das Markusevangelium'. Darin leſen wir: ‚Die Geſchichte von dem (von Herodes dem Großen befohlenen) Kindermord iſt jedenfalls nicht hiſtoriſch; ſie will zeigen, wie der irdiſche König trotz aller Grauſamkeit dem himmliſchen König nichts anhaben kann.' So iſt alſo der bibliſche Bericht unwahr und die Bibel ein Lügenbuch? — Von der bibliſchen Geſchichte über die Hinrichtung des Täufers Johannes (Mark. 6, 14—29) heißt es in dieſem Artikel weiter: ‚Dieſe Erzählung klingt wie eine grauſige Volkserzählung. In der Form, wie ſie da ſteht, iſt ſie nicht hiſtoriſch.' Alſo lügt die Bibel nach dem Verfaſſer des Artikels!"

Der Geheime Oberkirchenrat ſchreibt nun eine maßvolle Entgegnung an die Schriftleitung des Bibelbundes. Darin heißt es dann aber zum Schluß: „Im übrigen bedaure ich es, daß Sie . . . mit der grotesken Logik, die mir beſonders in den Blättern der Miſſouriſynode oft aufgefallen iſt, dem Verfaſſer [jenes Artikels] und weiterhin mir zur Laſt legen, wir machten die Bibel [will ſagen: die geſamte Bibel; d. Red.] zu einem Lügenbuch."

Der Schriftleiter des Bibelbundes hat ſich nun glücklicherweiſe durch jenen ſpöttiſchen Hinweis auf die verdrehten Miſſourier nicht einſchüchtern laſſen, ſondern hat ſich ein Herz gefaßt und unter anderm geantwortet:

„Sie zeihen mich einer grotesken Logik à la Miſſouri. Glauben Sie

etwa, daß der Verfasser des Artikels wirklich in der ganzen Bibel nur an den beiden aufgeführten Beispielen Kritik zu üben sich berechtigt fühlt? Sie scheinen die Form der Darstellung für unwesentlich zu halten; wenn aber der Verfasser erklärt, die Geschichte der Hinrichtung des Johannes in der Form, das heißt doch in der Darstellung, wie die Bibel sie bringt, sei nicht historisch, so macht er meines Erachtens der Bibel den Vorwurf der falschen Darstellung, also der Unwahrhaftigkeit, das ist, der Lüge."

Wir danken dem Herrn Schriftleiter dafür, daß er uns wenigstens der Sache nach in Schutz nimmt, und möchten noch bemerken, daß wir Missourier seine getadelte Logik gern für uns in Anspruch nehmen. Denn sie ist die Logik des gesunden Menschenverstandes, die Logik des Volkes, das aus solcher Kritik der Bibel allerdings den Schluß zieht: Die Bibel ist ein Lügenbuch. Wenn aber dem Geheimen Oberkirchenrat solch eine Logik grotesk oder komisch vorkommt, dann möchten wir zunächst gerne einmal wissen, wo er denn Logik gelernt hat, und zum andern, was er dann z. B. zu der wahrhaft abenteuerlichen Logik der „Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung" sagt, die uns oft genug den Mund vor Staunen offenstehen läßt. (Vgl. die Ausführungen im „Els. Lutheraner" vom September 1931, S. 70 ff.) Allerdings den Missouriern gegenüber darf sich ja jeder Dummbart dergleichen Urteile erlauben, wieviel mehr ein Geheimer Oberkirchenrat! W. B.

Zweihundert Jahre Herrnhuter Mission. In diesem Jahre sind zwei Jahrhunderte verflossen, seit Zinzendorf die ersten Missionare nach den Westindischen Inseln ausschickte. Schon 1728 machte er Pläne, eine Heidenmission ins Leben zu rufen, und zwar unter den Mohammedanern; Kundschafter wurden in die Türkei und nach Afrika gesandt. Aber in Kopenhagen traf Zinzendorf mit einem westindischen Neger zusammen und wurde dadurch angeregt, seine ersten Missionare, Leonhard Dober und David Nitschmann, nach Westindien zu senden, um zunächst den Negersklaven auf der Insel St. Thomas das Evangelium zu predigen. Das war 1732. Dann breitete sich das Missionswerk der Brüdergemeinde rasch aus: 1733 nach Grönland, 1734 nach Lappland, dann zu den Indianern in Nordamerika, den Hottentotten in Afrika, den Eskimos in Labrador usw. Nach den „Allgemeinen Missionsnachrichten" sind in diesen zweihundert Jahren neben andern Hilfsarbeitern 1,555 Missionare ausgesandt worden, dazu 62 Missionskaufleute, 93 unverheiratete Missionsschwestern, zusammen 1,710 Europäer. Von diesen kamen 36 Missionare, 10 Schwestern und 4 Kinder auf gewaltsame Weise ums Leben, die meisten in der Indianermission.

Nicht in allen Stücken ist die Herrnhuter Mission vorbildlich. So hat sie sich mancherorts kein Gewissen daraus gemacht, in fremdes Amt zu greifen und Schafe zu stehlen (in Grönland z. B. hat sie sich in Hans Egedes Gemeinde eingeschlichen). Aber in e i n e m Stück steht sie unerreicht da: in dem Verhältnis zwischen Missionsarbeit und der Zahl der diese Mission unterstützenden Gemeinden und Gemeindeglieder. Die Brüdergemeinde zählt heute 58,932 Glieder in christlichen Ländern. Und diese verhältnismäßig kleine Kirche erhält 262 europäische Missionsarbeiter auf 135 Stationen in Südafrika, Ostafrika, Jerusalem, am Himalaya, in Alaska, Mittelamerika, Westindien, Demarara, Surinam und Labrador; diese bedienen im ganzen 120,236 Bekehrte und unterrichten in 440 Schulen 40,806 Schüler. T. H.

Mohammedanermiſſion. Über den Fortgang dieſer Miſſion in Perſien berichtet der anglikaniſche Biſchof in den „Allgemeinen Miſſionsnachrichten“: „Wir hatten während der Karwoche jeden Abend in Iſfahan Laternengottesdienſt. Jeden Abend war die Kirche immer mehr gedrängt voll, bis wir weiteren den Zutritt unterſagen mußten, und die Aufmerkſamkeit und Stille unter den Zuhörern war beſonders bemerkenswert. Wir hatten als Themen gewählt: ‚Warum JEſus kam‘, ‚Was JEſus lehrte‘, ‚Was JEſus tat‘, ‚Was JEſus für uns tun will‘. Am Karfreitag laſen wir die Abſchnitte vom Gericht und Tod. Ich glaube nicht, daß wir jemals ſchon ſolche Gottesdienſte mit einer ſolchen Beſucherzahl in Iſfahan hatten.“ Ein Beſuch in einem Dorf zur ſelben Zeit brachte eine Zuhörerſchaft von fünfhundert bei einer Geſamtbevölkerung von zweitauſend, die ſich Abend für Abend im Hof des Ortsvorſtehers zu einem Laternengottesdienſt verſammelte. Am Ende des Beſuches ſchloſſen ſich ſechs Perſonen zum regelmäßigen Bibelſtudium zuſammen. Trotzdem die Religionsfreiheit noch lange nicht geſichert iſt und viele Bekehrte von Haus und Hof vertrieben werden, berichtet doch jedes der Hauptzentren miſſionariſcher Arbeit von Taufbewerbern. Die ganze religiöſe Tendenz ſcheint ſich in Perſien zu ändern. Ein beſonders heiliger Begräbnisplatz in Meſhed, hinter dem Schrein Imam Rezas, wird gegenwärtig von der Regierung rückſichtslos von Gräbern gereinigt; die ausgegrabenen Gebeine werden einfach in Löcher geworfen; Schädel werden Ärzten auf Verlangen zu wiſſenſchaftlichen Zwecken geliefert; und es regt ſich kaum ein leiſes Murren gegen die Entweihung des Platzes.

Auch auf der Inſel Java wird eifrig unter den Mohammedanern miſſioniert. Java hat eine Bevölkerung von nahezu 42,000,000, 314 auf einen Quadratkilometer (Deutſchland hat eine Bevölkerungsdichte von 130 auf den Quadratkilometer), zum großen Teil mohammedaniſch. Es arbeiten dort 58 europäiſche Miſſionare, darunter 8 Ärzte; ihnen zur Seite ſtehen 59 Evangeliſten und Lehrer und 154 eingeborne Krankenpfleger. Die Zahl der Chriſten beträgt 3,949. T. H.

The Latest Statistics from India. — In September, so we are informed in an exchange, the government of India published the results of its census taken last February. According to this census the total population of India has now reached the high figure of 352,986,876. We are told that this means the population has increased 10.6 per cent. since 1921. What we are chiefly interested in are the figures for the field of religion, and they read as follows: Hindus, 238,330,912; Mohammedans, 77,743,928; Sikhs, 4,366,442; Christians, 5,961,794. The Sikhs (representing a sort of reformed Hinduism) showed the largest gain during the last ten years, more than 33 per cent. The gain for the Christians was 32.6 per cent. The Mohammedans grew 13.1 per cent. and the Hindus 10 per cent. Of the total Christian population almost two-thirds (3,968,623) are in South India, which includes the native states of Travancore and Cochin, Mysore, and Hyderabad. The report says that in the Hyderabad State, which is ruled by a Moslem prince, there has been the largest increase for the Christians; from 62,656 in 1921 they have grown to number 151,946. Here, so we are informed, a mass movement toward Christianity among the Hindu outcastes has been in progress. The strength of the various Christian denominations has not yet been made known. It is heartening to see

that Christianity has gained considerably. But only six million Christians over against a population of three hundred fifty million — what a disparity, what a cry for help in those figures! A.

Der Zionismus lebt noch immer. Der „Christliche Apologete" berichtet: „In der Welt-Zionistenkonferenz, die in Basel, Schweiz, tagte, wurde letzte Woche mit großer Stimmenmehrheit Nahum Sokolow, der seit Jahren als die rechte Hand Dr. Chaim Weizmanns galt, an Stelle dieses Herrn zum Präsidenten der Bewegung erwählt. In der offenen Sitzung der Delegaten wurde ein Voranschlag der Ausgaben für das nächste Jahr im Betrage von $1,800,000 bewilligt." J. T. M.

Übertritte zur lutherischen Kirche in Österreich. In einem Bericht aus „D. E. D." teilt der „Lutherische Herold" mit: „Im Jahre 1927 wurden in der evangelischen Kirche in Deutsch-Österreich 3,980 Eintritte und 2,565 Austritte gezählt. Die meisten Übertritte zum Protestantismus kamen den lutherischen Gemeinden, eine kleine Zahl den reformierten zugute."

J. T. M.

Book Review. — Literatur.

Psalms. By *W. G. Scroggie.* Harper and Brothers. 144 pages, 4×6. Price, $1.25.

This is a brief commentary on the first 41 psalms, prefaced by an introduction treating of Hebrew poetry and the divisions, the authorship, the titles, the character of the Psalter and including a reading scheme according to which the entire Psalter may be read every month. We were delighted to read the following exposition of the Twenty-second Psalm, which may serve as a sample of the style of the author: —

"This amazing psalm is in two distinct parts. The first part is a *sob* (1—21), and the second is a *song* (22—31). The key to Part One is, 'Thou answerest not, and to Part Two, 'Thou hast answered. The first part tells of sufferings, and the second part, of the glory that follows (1 Pet. 1, 11).

"Not a few answers have been given to the question, Who is the sufferer? But there is only one answer that fits the facts: . . . the sufferer is Jesus. It has truly been said that 'the psalmist gives a more vivid description of the sufferings of Christ on the cross than the authors of the gospels.' Mark carefully the parallels. Christ's dying cry (1); the mockers gathered round the cross and their taunts (7. 8. 12. 13); torture by crucifixion (16); the distorted body (14. 17); the parched tongue and lips (15); the divided garments and unrent vesture (18); and at last the sudden silence in death. Why is there no mention of the spear thrust? Because Christ was already dead when that was done, and the Sufferer could not be represented as telling what happened after He had died.

"The most poignant utterance of Jesus discloses the most tragic factor in His sufferings, namely, His being forsaken of God (1); note, He does not say, 'My Father — why?' Now, of no one but Jesus could these words (1—21) have been written, for we know of no one in history but Himself who had such an experience. This, therefore, is pure prophecy, genuine prediction, and whoever was the writer of the psalm, he was writing by

inspiration of events which were not to be fulfilled for probably a thousand years and not relating any experience of his own or of another in the past. Get thoroughly hold of that.

"And now kneel at the foot of the cross and read verses 1—21 and sing softly to yourself: 'Alas! and did my Savior bleed?' etc."

On the other hand, we were painfully surprised to find in this book also many concessions to modern theology, which make an unqualified recommendation impossible. T. Laetsch.

The Foundations of Bible History. (Joshua and Judges.) By *John Garstang, M. A., D. Litt.*, etc. Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York. Illustrated. 1931. XXIV and 423 pages, 5½×8⅝. Price, $5.00.

Largely on the basis of the results obtained in the recent excavations at Hazor, Jericho, and Ai (financed by Sir Charles Marston, to whom this book is dedicated) Prof. John Garstang of the University of Liverpool presents in this volume the latest archeological light on a number of questions involved in the conquests and settlement of Canaan by the Hebrews. It is a noteworthy publication, not only because of the archeological experience of the author, but also because it definitely tends to verify a number of fundamental Biblical statements in the Books of Joshua and Judges.

Garstang, of course, is not motivated by any harmonistic tendencies. He accepts without question the dismemberment of the books of Joshua and Judges according to the current and critical literary analysis. He believes, for example, that there is a discrepancy between Josh. 15, 63, which records that the children of Judah could not drive out the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the statement in Judg. 1, 8 that "the children of Judah fought against Jerusalem and took it and smote it with the edge of the sword" (not conceding either that the two events refer to two altogether different military movements or that the second conquest, as the World War campaigns so frequently emphasized, might be merely temporary). Such "numerous discrepancies" he cites as one of the evidences for the justification of the textual analysis. Ruling out the alleged amplification of the Deuteronomic school (D) in the sixth century and the further post-exilic supplementing and editing "from the view of the organized priesthood" (P), he restricts his investigation to what criticism recognizes as the oldest portions of Joshua-Judges, the sources represented by the symbols J, E, and JE. In this he follows quite generally the critical partition of the late Canon Burney in his commentary of Judges, 1918.

After a presentation of this mutilated text, Garstang comes to the object of his study: the investigation of the accuracy and truth of the Biblical statements as illumined by the light of his expedition in 1928 and similar subsequent efforts. He accepts, because of the testimony of the Tel-el-Amarna letters and the Biblical chronology in 1 Kings 6, 1, the earlier date of the Exodus, making Thotmes III and Amenophis II, respectively, the Pharaohs of the Oppression and the Exodus, and places 1407 B. C. as the nearest available approximation to the year of the opening of the Book of Joshua.

After a general description of the Palestinian territory and terrain the third section discusses the campaign led by Joshua. Typical of similar results is the summary of the archeological history of Jericho. Garstang,

as we read his report, brings these interesting corroborations of Joshua's narrative: 1) Jericho occupied a strategic location; yet it was isolated, remote from any center of authority. 2) It was surrounded by great defensive walls, on which houses had been built. 3) These walls actually collapsed and fell outward, and this catastrophe is dated on archeological evidence at a time chronologically compatible with the Biblical statement. Thus Garstang concludes (p. 147): "The evidence all points, then, toward the year 1400 B. C. for the fall of Jericho." 4) Joshua's charge that the city was not to be rebuilt was apparently observed, because after its destruction, Garstang concludes, "the city lay in ruins with no appreciable population for some five hundred years" (p. 147).

Similar archeological deductions, though not always as precise and detailed, are found in the following sections, which speak of the destruction of Ai (p. 6), the relief of Gibeon (p. 7), the fall of Hazor (p. 8), the allotment of the tribal areas (p. 9), Judah and Simeon (p. 10), Ephraim and Manasseh (p. 11), tribal portions in the north (p. 12), death of Joshua and the elders (p. 13), restorations of peaceful conditions in Egypt (p. 14), establishment of the northern tribes (p. 15), Shamgar and the Philistines (p. 16) (significant because, while the early mention of the Philistines is generally regarded by critics as an anachronistic gloss, Garstang is not definitely opposed to an early Philistine infiltration), the reunion of the tribes under Deborah (p. 17), the conquest for a leader (p. 18), movement toward kingship (p. 19), Philistine rule over Israel (p. 20).

One of the most valuable features of the book is the 53-page supplement, listing place names and the archeological light shed on their identity. The photographs, all taken by the author, are far better and more copious than the usual run of such illustrations. W. A. Maier.

Forschungen zur Entstehung des Urchristentums, des Neuen Testaments und der Kirche. III. Personenprobleme der Apostelgeschichte: Johannes Markus, Silas und Titus. IV. Röm. 15; letzte Reiseziele des Paulus: Jerusalem, Rom und Antiochien. V. Der nichtpaulinische Ursprung des Parallelismus der Apostel Petrus und Paulus. III: Großoktav; 32 Seiten. IV: Großoktav; 23 Seiten. V: Großoktav; 32 Seiten. Verlag von Walter G. Mühlau, Kiel. Die größeren Hefte je RM. 1.60, das kleine RM. 1.20.

Wir bringen eine kurze Besprechung dieser Serie aus nur einem Grunde: Wenn man wirklich einmal sehen will, wie weit manche neuere Kritiker gehen, wenn sie mit Konjekturalkritik, mutmaßlichen Auslassungen, unbekannten Quellen, Interpolationen usw. operieren, so kann diese Serie als Muster empfohlen werden. Man hätte derartige Studien seit dem Zusammenbruch der Tübinger Schule und seit Erscheinung der Forschungen von Ramsay, Zahn und andern kaum noch für möglich gehalten. So soll z. B. Johannes Markus nicht aus Jerusalem gestammt haben, sondern aus der Insel Zypern; Titus soll Mitbegründer der Gemeinde zu Korinth gewesen sein; Silas wird als Autor der „Wir-Berichte" in der Apostelgeschichte hingestellt; der Römerbrief soll ein Brief an die Gemeinde zu Antiochien sein; Gal. 2, 7. 8 soll eine nichtpaulinische Struktur haben usw., usw. ad nauseam. Der krasseste Subjektivismus, ohne auch nur eine Spur von common sense, geschweige Achtung vor objektiver Geschichtsforschung. Ein abschreckendes Beispiel!

P. E. Kretzmann.

Why I Believe. By *Teunis E. Gouwens, D. D.* 147 pages. Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn. Price, $1.00.

In judging modern theological literature, we must not fail to apply that touchstone which is implied in the question, "What think ye of Christ?" Paul, speaking of Christ, not only said, "Who loved me," but added, "And gave Himself for me." Gal. 2, 20; and what Paul meant by the latter statement he clearly tells us when in the very next chapter of his epistle he says: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree," Gal. 3, 13. Again, in judging modern theological literature, we must not let ourselves be deceived by pious phraseology and even a liberal use of Biblical language, which nevertheless is not at all meant to say what the Bible clearly teaches and what the Christian Church has always taught.

In the book *Why I Believe*, Gouwens, in the second chapter, gives *his* answer to the question, "Why do I believe in Christ?" He says: "Before we can state why we believe in Christ we must say what we believe about Him. A full statement here obviously involves a larger task than we have time to undertake in this discussion. But we may summarize our faith in a sentence or two. When we speak of belief in Christ, we mean that in Him we see what God is and what man may become. We mean further that through Him, through His teachings, His sufferings, His death, and His abiding spirit, we are lifted above sin, protected from spiritual harm, inspired to noble effort, and exalted to the coveted experience of peace and joy which only fellowship with God can give." And in the closing paragraph of the chapter he sums up as follows: "And all that we have been saying may be summed up in the one unquestionable and finally convincing statement that He saves us. You know the fear, the doubt, the sorrow, the weakness, and the sin which drag you down; and you know, if you have been sincere in your allegiance, that Christ, and Christ alone, can lift you up and sustain you with the certainty of abundant and eternal life. We believe in Jesus Christ because He went to the farthest limit of sacrifice and suffered death on the cross for our eternal good." That is as close as Gouwens gets to Christ. The entire chapter does not contain one clear, unmistakable statement that Christ, the eternal Son of God, very God of very God, became man and put Himself under the Law and suffered and died in the sinner's stead and thus, by fulfilling the Law and suffering the sinner's punishment, became the world's only Savior, whom man apprehends by faith, which is wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit through the Gospel.

In the chapter "Why I believe in the Bible," Gouwens says: "We are not trying to defend the view that there is no evidence of human cooperation in the composition of the Bible, that the text is perfect, that one may dip in anywhere and find teaching which harmonizes with the Sermon on the Mount, and that there are no mistakes in it. When we say we believe in the Bible, we do not mean that we believe it was dictated word for word by the Holy Ghost and preserved without error through the centuries. Nor do we mean that the book was meant to be used as an authority in the realms of science and history. When we speak of the Bible, we speak of the world's supreme book of religion. . . . Since the

Book is not designed to give information on science, we need not reject it on account of its primitive views of the universe. Since the Bible represents growth, it is inevitable that it should have in it some crude notions of morality. Nor need our confidence in the book as our reliable guide to God and life be shaken by the fact that errors have been found in it." These few quotations characterize the book. J. H. C. Fritz.

Die Gottesstimme im Menschenherzen. Von Dr. Heinrich Engel. Adolf-Klein-Verlag, Leipzig, 1930. 52 Seiten 6×9. Preis: M. 1.50.

Der Titel dieses Buches wird vom Verfasser selber näher erklärt: „Aussprüche griechischer und römischer Schriftsteller als Zeugnisse aus dem heidnischen Altertum für ewig unwandelbare Wahrheiten." Zur Charakterisierung des Buches wäre etwa dies zu sagen. Wir leben im Zeitalter der vergleichenden Religionswissenschaft. Diese Bewegung hat zwei Seiten: 1. Anerkennung der Gleichberechtigung aller Religionen, inkl. der christlichen; 2. Annahme, daß heidnische Philosophie vorbereitend auf das Christentum gewirkt habe. Dies Buch scheint zu der letzten Gattung zu gehören. Es führt die Zeugnisse aus den verschiedenen heidnischen Klassikern zusammen mit den Schriftstellen auf, von denen der Verfasser meint, daß sie parallel seien, was natürlich eine Vermischung von absoluter und relativer Wahrheit bedeutet. Der Heide vermag seine Unfähigkeit in geistlichen Dingen und die Unzulänglichkeit seiner Religion einigermaßen zu erkennen, nicht aber den Weg zur wahren Glückseligkeit zu finden. Unter keinen Umständen kann irgendeine falsche Religion als vorbereitend auf das Evangelium bezeichnet werden. *Οὐ δύναται γνῶναι*, 1 Kor. 2, 14. P. E. Kretzmann.

Das Ende des Idealismus im Zeitalter Bismarcks. Von *Wilhelm Luetgert*. XIV und 480 Seiten 7×9¾. 1930. C. Bertelsmann, Guetersloh. Price, M. 18.

Luetgert is a philosopher of history, who is now teaching in the theological faculty of the University of Berlin. To find a German book written in a comprehensible style — readily comprehensible to those who have not grown up with the strange vocabulary and new idioms of modern German — is a rare thing. To find a German university Professor, a philosopher, even a theologian, who does not only avoid the stilted, marinated, artificial German which now prevails in scientific and religious literature as well as in fiction and journalism, is an experience that comes only once in a decade. Luetgert's *Ende des Idealismus* is written in pellucid German, its style is simple and natural although the author discusses so difficult a subject as the changing thought-patterns that characterize the history of the German mind during the age of 1820—1870 and the spiritual and political upheavals which resulted from these changing attitudes. The Awakening, the conflict between the empire and Romanism, Socialism, the decline of Classicism, Darwinism and Nietzsche, pessimism and naturalism, all are treated with a fulness of information, sureness of touch, and clarity of style which makes the reading of the book a delight.

The decline of Idealism is traced through a number of clearly defined stages. The theology of the Awakening was a sister of idealistic philosophy. Luetgert recognizes the antagonism of idealistic theology to the Reformation. He traces both, the idealism of the philosophers and the theology of the Awakening, to mysticism as their common religious ground (p. 382).

If the Awakening led to the downfall of Idealism, it was because "on one point the theologians of this movement were in agreement with the Reformation: the inability of human reason to know and love God. They perceived in idealistic philosophy a self-consciousness which was not broken and humiliated by sin. If in Kant, conscience was first of all consciousness of duty, the theologians of the Awakening looked upon conscience as primarily a consciousness of guilt." Starting at this point, we finally reach the restoration of Orthodoxy in Philippi (pp. 383—385). Luetgert recognizes the folly of attempting to preach the Gospel in the light of source criticism and from the viewpoint of materialistic science (p. 76). He points out time and again the evils of the union of Church and State, which had to result either in entanglements with secular politics or in a hopeless conflict with the State. He points out the inability of the critical theories to account for the fact that the worship of God in spirit and in truth developed out of the religion of Israel (p. 373). "Eliminating the miraculous from the life of Christ did more than simply remove that trait from the Christ portrait; His entire countenance changed and finally became unrecognizable. The *deed* disappeared from the life of Christ, and nothing remained but a speaker and his self-consciousness" (p. 375). It was an age in which under the pressure of materialism, rather of atheism, the higher circles of society became pessimists; the lower, Communists (p. 251). The dechristianization of the masses is explained as a result of state-church conditions. "The dependence of the Church and her government upon the State and therefore upon the changing politics deepened the distrust of the Church among the cultured and even more so among the lower classes of society, especially when the conflict with Socialism had arisen" (p. 440). The *Kulturkampf* in the course of time lost much of its purely political character and served to lend aid to the antichurch elements in the German nation (p. 84). The age was characterized by the dechristianization of the humanistic gymnasium. "Both the Christian and the classical interests were relegated to the background, and the result was a spiritless instruction, consisting mainly in the preparation for examinations, but leaving the heart and soul empty."

We were reminded of the expressions heard from the lips of Dr. Stoeckhardt and Dr. Krauss when reading Luetgert's description of the antichristian and mammon-worshiping sentiment which developed in Germany after the smashing defeat of France in 1870. Luetgert quotes Stoecker: "Our present time is without belief" (p. 411). Theoretical and practical materialism prevailed. In 1876 no one contradicted the sentiment: "The German people to-day is the least churchly among the Protestant nations" (p. 413). Religion was discarded in favor of *Bildung*. Compulsory education and military training were glorified. "If the middle class had remained comparatively sound, it at this time constituted a layer of society, above it a glacier, under it a volcano, evermore thinning out under the frost from above and the hot crater from below" (p. 441). "How poorly prepared were the upper ten thousand for the coming catastrophe when in the upper circles of society and culture the principles of conduct had become so obscure! Christian faith had degenerated into a superficial optimism, which had to go to pieces in its contact with historic experiences" (p. 255). Really, materialism had never satisfied the people. Fontane is

quoted: "The great tendency of the time is apostasy, but we are getting weary of it. The world was sickened by Haeckelism and thirsts for the restoration of the ideal" (p. 430). "Pessimism was a necessary result of materialistic science. The world view became increasingly distempered as the God idea receded. After this light, which once had shown through the curtain of nature, had been extinguished, nature herself became dark, especially since with the belief in God also the hope of immortality disappeared" (p. 257). What we find wanting in the book is a call for the return of the nation to the principles of the Lutheran Reformation and to simple faith in the Word of God. THEODORE GRAEBNER.

My Church and Others. A Summary of the Teachings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as Distinguished from Those of Other Denominations. Second edition. By *John Theodore Mueller*, Professor of Systematic Theology, Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. Publisher: Rudolph Volkening, St. Louis, Mo. 88 pages, 5×7. Price, 75 cts.

When this book first appeared, in 1926, it at once became popular, evidently supplying a real want. Thousands of copies were sold, and expressions of satisfaction with the book came from many sides. Concerning the second edition the Foreword says: "For various reasons both the author and the publisher deemed it advisable to leave this little guide just as it appeared in its first edition. Only such changes as were necessary have been made, and all statistical matters have been revised up to date." Evidently the arrangement of the material in two large sections, one entitled "Doctrine," the other, "Description," has proved serviceable. For those who are not acquainted with the book we state that in the first part the author, when discussing a given doctrine, presents the teachings of the Scriptures and then submits the antithesis, mentioning the various church denominations which reject that particular doctrine of Holy Scripture. The second part furnishes a brief history and other descriptive details with respect to the various denominations, their names being given in alphabetical order. The book truly contains *multum in parvo*. The presentation is always concise, brief, and simple. Altogether the work admirably serves its purpose of furnishing in small compass an authoritative guide to one who wishes to obtain a correct view of the church-bodies surrounding us. W. ARNDT.

Die evangelische Mission in Niederländisch-Indien. Von D. Julius Richter. (Allgemeine Evangelische Missionsgeschichte, Band V, Heft 1.) Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann in Gütersloh. 1931. 167 Seiten 6½×9. Preis: M. 5.50.

Der bekannte Verfasser, der von vielen als die erste Missionsautorität der Gegenwart angesehen wird, hat schon vier große Bände seiner „Allgemeinen Evangelischen Missionsgeschichte" erscheinen lassen: „Indische Missionsgeschichte", „Mission und Evangelisation im Orient", „Geschichte der evangelischen Mission in Afrika", „Das Werden der christlichen Kirche in China". Das waren große, geschlossene Missionsgebiete, die einheitlich behandelt werden mußten und konnten. Mit dem fünften Bande, von dem nun das erste Heft vorliegt, steht es etwas anders. Da soll behandelt werden Fern- und Südost-Asien, Australien, Amerika

und Niederländisch-Indien. Bei diesen Gebieten ist die Abteilung in Lieferungen angezeigt, einmal weil die Interessentenkreise für die einzelnen Gebiete vielfach verschieden sind, und sodann, weil die Literatur zum Teil sehr schwer zu beschaffen ist und doch möglichst vollständig verarbeitet werden soll. Nur durch einen Zuschuß von seiten der „Notgemeinschaft für die deutsche Wissenschaft" ist die Drucklegung ermöglicht worden. Das vorliegende Heft behandelt nun, wie schon der Titel angibt, die verschiedenen Missionen in Niederländisch-Indien auf Java, Sumatra, Nias, Borneo, Celebes, Neuguinea usw. Der Verfasser beginnt mit der portugiesisch-katholischen Mission in jenem Gebiete, schildert die holländische Kolonialmission und dann besonders die Missionsarbeit im neunzehnten Jahrhundert bis auf die Gegenwart. Am Schlusse findet sich eine Statistik und ein Namen- und Sachregister, wodurch der Wert des Buches erhöht wird. Niemand, der tiefer in die Missionsgeschichte eindringen will, wird an diesen umfassenden Werken vorübergehen können. L. Fürbringer.

Hymns in Human Experience. By *Wm. J. Hart.* 221 pages, 5×7. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, New York. Price, $2.00.

From year to year there seems to be a growing interest in the hymns of the Christian Church, and publishers are issuing a goodly number of books that treat their origin and history. This newest volume brings stories about nearly one hundred and fifty hymns. They are grouped under the following heads: I. A Singing Faith. II. Songs in the Night. III. Hymns Mothers Loved. IV. When Preachers Sing. V. Songs of Soldiers. VI. Heard within Prison Walls. VII. The Music of Submerged Lives. VIII. Songs of Salvation. IX. "The Old Rugged Cross." X. Hymns of Youth. XI. Hymns as Prayers. XII. Songs of the Negroes. XIII. Christmas and Easter Melodies. XIV. Funeral Music. XV. Hymns on Patriotic Occasions. Our pastors will find this a handy volume because of the illustrative material for sermons and addresses which it offers.

W. G. Polack.

Books Received. — Eingegangene Literatur.

Boulton, Pierce & Co., Chicago: —

Strategy in Handling People. By *Ewing T. Webb* and *John J. B. Morgan, Ph. D.*, Associate Professor of Psychology, Northwestern University. 260 pages, 5½×9. Price, $3.00.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.: —

Amerikanischer Kalender für deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1932. 162 Seiten. Preis: 15 Cts.

Lutheran Annual, 1932. 162 pages. Price, 15 cts.

Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Convention of the Oregon and Washington District. Vol. 1931, No. 5. 56 pages. Price, 33 cts. Doctrinal essays: "The Missionary Activities as Recorded in the Acts, Models for Present-day Mission-work," by Pastor H. Engelbrecht; *Die Bedeutung der Augsburgischen Konfession fuer die Gegenwart*, by Pastor J. A. Rimbach.

Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Convention of the California and Nevada District. Vol. 1931, No. 7. 56 pages. Price, 21 cts. Doctrinal essay: "Some Lessons of the Ante-Nicene Age," by Prof. P. E. Kretzmann, D. D.

Verhandlungen der achtzehnten Jahresversammlung des Texas-Distrikts. Jahrgang 1931, Nr. 8. 74 Seiten. Preis: 17 Cts. Referat: „Der achte Artikel der Konkordienformel, ‚Von der Person Christi'." Referent: Prof. Theo. Lätsch.

Verhandlungen der vierundbreißigsten Jahresversammlung des Süd-Wisconsin-Distrikts. Jahrgang 1931, Nr. 6. 93 Seiten. Preis: 18 Cts. Referate: „Warum halten wir trotz aller Fortschritte und Veränderungen fest an dem alten Evangelium?" Referent: P. G. Kanieß. "True Happiness." Referent: P. K. Wedel.

Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Sachsen:

Evangelisch-Lutherischer Hausfreund-Kalender. 1932. Begründet von D. O. Willkomm. Berlin-Zehlendorf. 48. Jahrgang. Mit Titelbild von Albrecht Dürer. 96 Seiten 5½×8½. Preis: 20 Cts.

Casa Publicadora Concordia, Porto Alegre, Brasilien:

Lutherkalender für Südamerika. 1932. Achter Jahrgang. 164 Seiten 6×9. Preis: 15 Cts.

Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte. M. Heinsius' Nachfolger, Eger & Sievers, Leipzig:

Jahrgang 45, Heft 2: **Die Anfänge der evangelischen Bekenntnisbildung bis 1529/30.** Vortrag, gehalten von Hans von Schubert. 39 Seiten 6×9. Preis: M. 1.50. — Jahrgang 45, Heft 3: **Der Reichstag von Augsburg im Zusammenhang der Reformationsgeschichte.** Vortrag von Hans von Schubert. 36 Seiten. Preis: M. 1.50.

Jahrgang 47, Heft 1: **Die Geschichte des Speyrer Reichstags 1529.** Von Johannes Kühn. 267 Seiten. Preis: M. 6.80.

Jahrgang 48, Heft 2: **Der Protestantismus in Steiermark im Zeitalter der Reformation und Gegenreformation.** Von D. theol. Paul Dedic. 174 Seiten. Preis: M. 4.40.

A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig:

Das Problem der Gotteserkenntnis in der Religionsphilosophie Max Schelers. Von Lic. Dr. Johannes Heber. 106 Seiten 5½×8½. Preis: M. 5.

Please Take Notice.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Jan 32" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.

LESSONS IN THE CATECHISM OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER

By Professor [illegible]

¶ This book was first published [illegible] was not originally designed as a book, but [illegible] for the Senior Departments of the *Sunday-school Lessons* published [illegible]. A popular demand for book form of these [illegible] was cheerfully complied with. The [illegible] was published in 1928. Now we are [illegible] the book [illegible] with a new preface by the Rev. W. H. [illegible] with the text of the Small Catechism printed at the head of the book, [illegible] in the lessons, and with the "Christian Questions" and [illegible] appended to the *Lessons*.

¶ Pastor [illegible] has not seen fit to change the book essentially. [illegible] can easily be used in classes where [illegible] edition.

¶ Dr. Mezger [illegible] in the Zehlendorf theological school [illegible] press. In our original announcement [illegible] represented the fruition of Dr. Mezger's [illegible] of catechetics. We are free to report [illegible] of the book have served a useful purpose [illegible] in classes of adults or adolescents, [illegible] of pastors and teachers. Mezger's [illegible] of the well-known Catechism truths [illegible] many an earnest teacher in the home [illegible]. We feel confident that this [illegible] to new users.

¶ The original [illegible] cents. Subsequently it was reduced [illegible] cents. To-day's cost of production [illegible] even 75 cents, but we have resolved [illegible] 50 cents for the book.

¶ In its new form Mezger's *Lessons in the Catechism of Dr. Martin Luther* covers [illegible] pages (size [illegible]) and is bound in attractive pale-blue cloth [illegible].

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE
[illegible] SAINT LOUIS, MO.